

[13th March 1923]

## APPENDIX B

[Vide answer to question No. 873 asked by Rao Bahadur M. C. Raja at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 13th March 1923; page 2217 supra.]

*Extent of land assigned to the depressed classes for cultivation from 1st April 1922 to 31st December 1922.*

	ACS.		ACS.
1. Agency ... ..	Nil.	13. Guntur ... ..	2,135.22
2. Anantapur ... ..	1,920.88	14. Kistna ... ..	1,039.89
3. North Arcot ... ..	966.42	15. Kurnool ... ..	2,101.00
4. South Arcot ... ..	217.85	16. Madura ... ..	1,879.74
5. Bellary ... ..	1,067.98	17. Nellore ... ..	1,292.77
6. South Kanara ... ..	13.44	18. The Nilgiris ... ..	Nil.
7. Chingleput ... ..	474.25	19. Ramnad ... ..	37.45
8. Chittoor ... ..	486.99	20. Salem ... ..	140.83
9. Coimbatore ... ..	366.90	21. Tanjore ... ..	73.17
10. Cuddapah ... ..	1,031.54	22. Tinnevely ... ..	203.20
11. Ganjam ... ..	343.81	23. Trichinopoly ... ..	470.05
12. Godavari ... ..	112.08	24. Vizagapatam ... ..	45.34

## III

## COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

The SECRETARY laid on the table G.O. No. 98, Judicial (Police), dated 1st March 1923, regarding the payment of gratuities to members of the City Police staff who worked in connexion with the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. \*

## IV

## MOTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR 1923-24.

## DEMAND II—EXCISE.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I beg to move Demand II—Excise Department—for the appropriation from the provincial receipts for the year 1923-24 of a sum of Rs. 29.07 lakhs."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Mr. President, as the circumstances of this particular vote are very peculiar, I would request permission to raise a general point of order before the House embarks upon the discussion of details.

" I may say at the outset that we have long since submitted proposals to the Government of India for the separation of Salt and Excise, and hoped to have received orders before the Budget. Unfortunately, there has been some difficulty at Delhi about the figures and we have had no reply from the Government of India yet. Nor have I received any answer to a telegram despatched on Saturday asking for permission to communicate the correspondence to the Council. We are, therefore, left with the same unsatisfactory situation that we had last year of a joint Budget which is voted upon by two different assemblies, this Council as regards Excise and the Legislative Assembly as regards Salt. The position is rendered more difficult because some of the items that go to make up the gross total, which is ultimately

13th March 1923]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

divided in the proportion of two-thirds to one-third, relate entirely to Salt works and others entirely to Excise establishment, while the majority are for work relating to both branches.

"The matter was discussed last year and hon. Members were good enough to accept a sort of convention that items relating purely to Salt works should be left untouched and that votes for reduction of items which belonged both to Salt and Excise should not exceed two-thirds of the total amount so as to leave the one-third that belonged to the Salt administration intact.

"The legal position is somewhat obscure. It might perhaps have been contended that the only votable item here is a provincial share of the gross total. But that is a contention which, whether it was legally correct or not, I should never have ventured to suggest. On the other hand, short of that, it is difficult to see how the interests of the Central Subjects, for which I am responsible, can be safeguarded. I think the best means of doing this would be to adopt a convention on the lines of that which was adopted last year.

"I do not know if I am entitled to ask you for a ruling to this effect; but, if not, I would ask hon. Members who are moving motions on the subject to give me this extent of assistance in my administration of the central branch of the subject."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Probably the hon. Member will tell me exactly what the point of order is."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"The point is whether the vote of this House on an item which refers purely to Salt administration can be taken and whether this House is competent, in the case of an item which refers to both branches of the department, to cut out more than two-thirds; in other words, to cut out the portion of the joint staff which serves the Salt Department and not the Excise Department."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Hon. Members may remember the discussion we had last year on this subject. It was then I think that several hon. Members were good enough to waive their motions on the assurance given by the hon. the Finance Member that before the Budget came forward again the two items would be separated. But, unfortunately, that has not been done. I am not blaming the hon. the Finance Member for it. No doubt, there is some difficulty in the matter. But the question, so far as we are concerned, is what exactly our powers are in regard to the items in the Excise Budget, and on this I have no hesitation in ruling that the powers of the House are complete. The only items which the Council is not competent to deal with are the italicized items which His Excellency has withheld from the vote of this House. The whole Budget is placed before the House by His Excellency, and it is perfectly competent to the House to vote upon any of the non-italicized items. But, at the same time, I think there will be no use in not recognizing the fact that any vote that the House might give so far as it affects the Salt Department will be really of no value, because the Council is not competent to deal with matters of expenditure which are not debitable to the provincial revenues. Therefore, it has to be understood that any retrenchment which the House may make will operate only so far as the percentage of expenditure is debitable to the provincial finances. I dare say it could not be very difficult for the hon. the Finance Member later on to make the necessary adjustments. That is all I can say at this stage. But it will be manifestly inconvenient in regard to these items to say just now how



[The President]

[13th March 1923]

far they relate to Salt or to Abkāri. The best thing will be to deal with the two departments as one. But, at the same time, if any motion for retrenchment should be passed, then of course the question how much of it will pertain to Salt, and how much to Abkāri, will have to be considered, and in putting the matter finally to the vote, we shall, if possible, try to split up any such item with the help of the hon. the Finance Member."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"I take it, Sir, that you propose that we deal with this question at the close of this demand. Or would it be more convenient in the case of such items, as you have anticipated, to move for a supplementary demand on the 27th for any items necessary for the Salt administration?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I think it will be well not to tie ourselves up to any decision just now."

MOTION No. 32.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—Sir, I move—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 36,000 for two Deputy Commissioners.*

"The Excise Department is one of those departments to which some of the general remarks I had to make during the general discussion of the Budget apply with very great force. One of the points, Sir, on the non-official side of this House that have been pressed on the Government is to consider the necessity for a long chain of officers who are supervising the work of those below each of them and so on up to the last man and for bringing into existence a more satisfactory and a more effective arrangement for the administration of the department. As I said, my general remarks apply with very great force to this particular department of Excise. In this department you have the lowest man who is called the salt peon; then you have the Sub-Inspector above him who is supposed to go out and do the work. Above him you have the Assistant Inspector whose functions it is rather difficult to indicate. It may be said that all these officers are necessary to supervise those under them and in that way lead to efficiency in the department. Above the Assistant Inspector again, you have the Inspector who probably has some executive powers in addition to those of supervision. Above him you have the Assistant Commissioners and then the Deputy Commissioners, and above these Deputy Commissioners you have the Commissioner. In addition to all these, you have also a Secretary to the Commissioner and thus there are a hierarchy of officials in this department.

"A layman like me who is not trained in the purely official method of doing things does not find any justification for this long chain of officers in one single department. I do not know, Sir, whether this long chain leads to absolute efficiency; but even if it does tend to the efficient working of the department, I should think we should be satisfied with even less efficiency and run this department with a smaller chain of officials. We, non-officials, really doubt whether this long chain of officials does tend to efficiency at all and whether the length of the chain itself does not lead to inefficiency in certain matters. By the Central Provinces Retrenchment Committee and by one or two other Retrenchment Committees, it has been suggested that there is no necessity for a Commissioner to look after Excise alone. Probably a Commissioner or a Director for Excise and Registration will amply serve the purpose. It is enough if one gentleman is

11-15 a.m.

13th March 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

asked to look after both the departments. I believe one or two provincial Governments are already contemplating the clubbing together of these two departments under one Director on the lines recommended by the Retrenchment Committees. I would appeal to the hon. the Minister for Excise to give serious consideration to the proposal of appointing one Director or Commissioner for both Excise and Registration. I hope he will not repeat the usual cry of efficiency and say that we have had the present system for very many years and that it is not easy to change it. In the Excise Department, we have three Deputy Commissioners and in addition to them we have the Assistant Commissioners. I do not see any necessity for having the link of the Deputy Commissioners between the Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioners. There is one Deputy Commissioner in the I.C.S. cadre who is said to be non-votable and so I have not been able to include him in this motion. Confining myself to the other two Deputy Commissioners who are votable, I should consider that there is no necessity at all for them. I have left the other Deputy Commissioner out of account not because I approve of his retention but because he does not come within the purview of the Vote of this House. The hon. the Minister for Excise was of the same opinion as most of us when he was out of office, and I hope he will give effect to his own views.

“With regard to the splitting up of the Salt and Excise Departments it was said that the matter was under correspondence with the Government of India. In answer to a question of mine, the hon. the Minister for Excise said that the question of differentiating between the establishment necessary for Salt and that necessary for Excise was under correspondence with the Government of India and final orders were expected. Well, Sir, there are only two possible answers for this reference to the Government of India. One is the Government of India may accept the proposal. In that case I should like to know from the hon. the Minister what the position of these officers will be: whether they will continue or not. The other possible answer from the Government of India is that they are unable to accept the recommendations of the Local Government. Even in that case, I should press for the abolition of these two officers and I should like to know whether the hon. the Minister would give effect to the abolition of these posts. I do hope that the hon. the Minister has not changed the strong views which he held before entering the *sanctum sanctorum* and that he will adhere to them and give effect to them now.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“Sir, I rise to support the motion before the House. As has been pointed out, there are three Deputy Commissioners between the Assistant Commissioners on the one side and the Commissioner on the other. It seems to me that there is not enough work for these Deputy Commissioners. I think that the work is not likely to suffer in any way if the whole cadre of Deputy Commissioners is once for all abolished.

“With reference to the motions under this head, the hon. the Finance Member said just now that the officers did work connected with the Salt Department, which was wholly Imperial, and the Excise Department, which was wholly Provincial, and that the proportion of expenditure borne by these two Governments, namely Imperial and Provincial, was in the ratio of 1:2. He appealed to the House to help him in the administration of Salt which was purely an Imperial subject. Personally I am willing to help the hon.



[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[13th March 1923]

the Finance Member in all possible ways, and I believe the entire House will also be willing to render him any assistance he may require. Leaving aside for a moment the proportion of expenditure that is to be borne by the Imperial and the Provincial Governments, it seems to me that there is no difficulty whatever in discussing these motions on the combined Department of Excise and Salt. It has nowhere been laid down that any particular rank of officers, say the Deputy Commissioner or the Assistant Commissioner, should do the work connected with the Imperial Government and the other officers should do the work connected with the Provincial Government. In the absence of any such restriction, there is no difficulty whatever in getting rid of the votable Deputy Commissioners.

“With regard to the legal difficulty raised by my hon. friend, the Finance Member, I cannot see any difficulty in it at all. Even accepting the difficulty there is no objection to reduce the amount of Rs. 36,000 by two-thirds, that is Rs. 24,000, and leave the balance of Rs. 12,000 to be utilized for expenditure on Salt administration. Having regard to all these circumstances, it seems to me very desirable that the House should vote for this motion of the abolition of the two Deputy Commissioners. We would have tabled a motion for the abolition of the third Deputy Commissioner also but for the fact that he came under the non-votable head.”

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“Sir, I rise to give my support to the motion before the House. We are having a plethora of officers in this department; as my hon. friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, put it, we are having a long chain of officers in this department. The question for the consideration of the House is whether this link of the Deputy Commissioners should be considered to be an integral part of the chain so as to justify its retention any longer. We are having nearly 900 Sub-Inspectors and over 100 Assistant Inspectors, not to speak of the 11 Assistant Commissioners. The question is whether there is any necessity, much less justification, for the two Deputy Commissioners in addition to the one Deputy Commissioner who is untouchable because he comes under the non-votable head. Whatever may be the nature of the work that may devolve upon these officers, I venture to submit that the allotment for these two Deputy Commissioners might be cut out having regard to the very large number of officers that the department already possesses besides these two officers. I submit that the chain will in no way suffer by the omission of this allotment.”

RAO BAHADUR C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—“Sir, I beg to support the motion before the House. As pointed out by my hon. friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, this department has too many officers. I submit that equally efficient supervision can be had with a smaller number of officers. At the top, there is the Secretary to the Commissioner; below him, there is the Deputy Commissioner who is non-votable; and along with him, there are two Deputy Commissioners. Below them, there are 11 Assistant Commissioners, 84 Inspectors, over 100 Assistant Inspectors and 900 Sub-Inspectors. I submit that the intermediary officers like the Deputy Commissioners may be done away with. They merely serve as post offices passing the papers from their subordinate to their superior officers. There is absolutely no necessity to retain them, and the efficiency of the department will in no way be impaired if they are done away with.”

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“Sir, I also want to say a few words in support of the motion before the House. At the outset, I should

13th March 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

like to say that there is no difficulty at all with regard to the question of *dyarchy*, between the Salt department and the Excise department. If this House vetoes this portion of the expenditure, the Government of India will only be very thankful to the House. They will be able to run this department at a lesser cost. If the expenses are decreased by one lakh, the Government of India will be immensely benefited. By accepting the motion to omit the allotment for the Deputy Commissioners, this House will be helping the hon. Members of the Imperial Assembly who are seriously engaged in retrenching the expenditure of the Government of India with a view to balance the Imperial Budget. If the motion is accepted, it will pave the way for the reduction of the proposed salt tax.

"Generally, the hon. Ministers are in charge of nation-building departments; but it is very unfortunate that the Transferred Department of Excise, which can in no sense be called a nation-building department but only a nation-destroying department, should be in charge of a Minister. If we cut down the grant under any of the nation-building departments, it will retard the progress of the country. But, if we reduce the grant under Excise, it will only be lessening the tyranny imposed upon the poor people of this country. By accepting this motion, the House will really be helping the people to a large extent.

"Coming to the question of Excise, it is most fortunate that the hon. the Minister who is in charge of this department should also be in charge of two other departments, namely, Education and Public Works. We are well aware that the hon. the Minister has effected drastic retrenchments in those two other departments while he has not been able to do anything in regard to this department. Instead of there being any reduction in the Budget Estimate under Excise, there is a considerable increase over that for the last year.

"To one other point I wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister, and it is this. It is accepted by everybody in this House that the so-called intermediary officers who are doing merely post office work should be done away with immediately. These officers simply pass the papers from their subordinate officers to the higher officers. Unfortunately, in this particular Department of Excise, there is not one post-office, but there are two post-offices. The three Deputy Commissioners serve as one post-office and below them the 11 Assistant Commissioners serve as another. While we are struggling against one post-office in all the Reserved subjects, we are obliged to be up in arms against two post-offices in a Transferred Department and we do not see any prospect of the hon. Minister raising up his hand to put an end to this evil.

"I hope, Sir, that at least at the end of this discussion, the hon. the Minister will be able to announce that he will do his best, if  
 11-30 a.m. not at once, at least in the near future, to put an end to these posts of Deputy Commissioners. We see here, Sir, that there are not only three Deputy Commissioners, but also one other person drawing a large scale of pay as Secretary to the Commissioner. Of course, he may as well do all the work that is now turned out by these Deputy Commissioners. We do want retrenchment and reduction in this department, and if that cannot be done in this particular case where we can certainly have a reduction, then there is no other possible way of doing it.



[Mr. U. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [13th March 1923]

"I remember the hon. the Finance Member saying last time that these Deputy Commissioners were doing excellent work. As I said last time, I may again repeat to-day that our Vote on this particular case has absolutely nothing to do with personalities. If these appointments are taken away, the three persons who are now Deputy Commissioners will find some appointment somewhere else and they will not in the least be affected personally. Many of us know these officers personally and have very high respect for them; but that is different from saying that we should necessarily retain these gentlemen in these posts. So, I would appeal to the hon. the Minister once for all to give us some hope of reduction in regard to this. We do not want to force his hands in any way; but we do expect him to hold out some hope in this direction. In spite of the strong views held by the hon. the Minister himself on this point, this department is the one where nothing has so far been done and where the poison has been allowed to go on in increasing doses among the masses. The hon. the Minister has not given us any hope by way of lessening the drink evil, but I hope he will do something in this direction by a reduction of the expenses so that we can have some retrenchment. With these few words, I strongly support the motion."

MR. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR:—"Mr. President, I also beg to support this motion for the abolition of the posts of the two Deputy Commissioners. I do not wish to add anything in support of this motion to what has already been said by my predecessors. But I would like just to point out to this House that even in Bengal the Retrenchment Committee that went into this question have recommended the abolition of these two posts. They say:

There are three Deputy Commissioners, but the evidence received by us is strongly against the employment of more than one, whose duties would be largely concerned with distilleries. We recommend that two of these posts be abolished.

And in Bengal they have not got the Personal Assistant to the Commissioner as we have here. So, I hope the hon. the Minister will see his way to abolish these posts."

MR. SAIYID MUHAMMAD PADSHA SAHIB:—"Mr. President, I beg to associate myself with all that has been said about the abolition of the posts of Deputy Commissioners. After all that has already been said on the subject, I do not think it is necessary for me to speak at any length on the motion, of which I also have given notice. All that I would like to point out to the House is that this is the one question on which this House has always presented a united front. Time and again this question has come up before it, and invariably all the non-official members have expressed themselves in favour of the abolition of these unnecessary officers in the long chain of the establishment in the Excise Department. Every time this demand was made by the non-official members of this House, the Government were at considerable pains to make out a case for the retention of these officers; but, as hon. Members of this House know, all that the Government were able to achieve was merely to make a sort of apology for the retention of these officers. They were never able to justify the necessity for their continuance in this department.

"Now, Sir, as everybody knows, in all executive departments, such as the Police, Forests and so forth, it is only on the subordinate officer that the brunt of the substantial work falls. Likewise, Sir, in this department it is the ill-paid Sub-Inspector that has to do most of the preventive and detective

13th March 1923] [Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib]

duty. It may be said, Sir, that we should not leave everything to the discretion of the low-paid officers as the Sub-Inspectors, and that there is some necessity for some sort of supervision. I admit that it might be necessary to have some supervising agency; but, Sir, to have such a long chain of supervising officers is quite unjustifiable and not at all warranted by the circumstances of the case. We have here a number of Sub-Inspectors and a number of Assistant Inspectors, and above them there are a number of responsible officers like the Circle Inspectors, over whom, again, we have about eleven Assistant Commissioners. At the head of these Assistant Commissioners are placed these Deputy Commissioners, and at the head of the department sits the Commissioner of Salt and Abkari. It seems as though we are having too much of supervision in this department, and much of the trouble in the management of the affairs of this department is due only to this overabundance and the over-dose of supervision that we are giving.

"There is another point of view from which also I think there is a necessity for doing away with unnecessary officers like these. The declared policy of the Government has all along been in favour of temperance. If the Government are really sincere in their professions—and I hope every one of my colleagues in this House does believe that Government are really sincere in this—they must show their *bona fides* by taking some real step towards the attainment of their object. The motive at the back of the mind of the Government in laying out their policy in regard to the Excise administration was that the drink evil in this country must be put down. We have already given a very fair trial to this policy. For nearly thirty or forty years we have been trying it. What is the result? We see that the consumption in this province, as in all other provinces of India, has advanced with the same gigantic strides with which the duty has increased. Hence, we see that the policy which we have been following with the pious hope of putting an end to this drink evil has been an utter failure. Therefore, we realize, Sir, that something further should be done if we are really anxious to put down this drink evil. With these words, I beg to support this motion."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, seven hon. Members have spoken on this motion and have urged reasons to support that the system of having many intermediary officers is an evil in itself, and that therefore it should be remedied. I am not at all opposed to the hon. Members in their desire for doing away with any such intermediary and unnecessary system. It is true that the system of administration which we are carrying on has several grades of officers, and that there are intermediary officers. In some departments they are necessary, while in others they are unnecessary. Therefore, on the principle of reducing as many of these intermediary officers as possible I am in entire agreement with the House. Hon. Members have also referred to the fact that, while I was sitting on the other side of the House I had urged this very question of the abolition of the Deputy Commissioners and other intermediary officers. That is quite true and I have not given up those views even now (hear, hear). I do say that intermediary officers must be done away with wherever they are unnecessary, and the administration must be thoroughly revised in order that the system may be reorganized, efficiency and economy may be observed quite thoroughly in their real sense.

"In the case of the Excise Department, some hon. Members have asked me why it is that this is the only department that I have not been able to



[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[13th March 1923]

overhaul or reorganize its machinery. My hon. colleague, the Finance Member, has placed before the House facts to show that we are not at all idle in regard to this matter. As a matter of fact, a scheme for the separation of Salt and Excise was prepared and placed before the Government of India in November last, but we have not heard anything definite from them as to what their views on the scheme proposed are. In the scheme that we have proposed for the reorganization of the Excise services, the question which the hon. Members have raised was fully considered. How far it is necessary to maintain the strength of the organization of this department will be fully considered; and, when it is feasible, I shall be the first to propose the abolition of these officers. But without a thorough examination of the matter after the proposals are returned by the Government of India, it is not possible for me to give any definite promise; nor can I say at present that I will abolish them immediately. My hon. friend opposite to me (Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar) said that I should give the House some hope in the matter. I give the hope that as soon as the scheme returns from the Government of India, the whole matter will be thoroughly examined, not only in regard to these posts, but also any other posts which may be found to be unnecessary, and fully considered in the light of the opinion of the House before me. I would, therefore, request my hon. friend to withdraw this motion."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I am not satisfied, Sir, with the insufficient information given to us on this point. We are fully entitled to know whether in the recommendations which have been made by the Madras Government it was proposed to retain these appointments or to abolish them. We thought, Sir, that the hon. the Minister for Excise would have considered it proper to take us into his confidence with regard to this matter. The hon. the Minister himself admitted that there were a number of links in the chain which might be unnecessary. But I think we ought to know what the actual recommendations made by the Madras Government are before I finally withdraw my motion."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I shall place all the information before the Finance Committee, Sir, soon after I receive a reply from the Government of India. My hon. friend is a member of that Committee. The recommendation made by us is the separation of Salt from the Excise, and when Excise becomes independent and a fully transferred subject, these further questions will be taken up and placed before the Finance Committee."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"With this assurance, Sir, from the hon. the Minister and with the hope that any recommendations made by the Finance Committee will be given effect to by the Government, I withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 33.

11-45 a.m.

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI :—"Sir, my motion reads thus—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,90,600 for Inspectors by Rs. 100.*

The object of this motion is not to reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,90,600 by Rs. 100, but is to bring to the notice of the Government how the supervision for which we pay so very heavily is not available just at the moment when it is wanted most. I wish to bring to the notice of the

13th March 1923]

[Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai]

House how the renters of toddy shops are handicapped for want of this supervision. The *fasli* year of toddy shops begins with the 1st of October. The shops are sold somewhere in August, and the highest bidder pays his initial deposit and he is given his licence. On the strength of this licence, he is authorized to apply for the necessary number of toddy trees being marked. By the time he makes his application it is about the end of September, because he has to put in his application for marking the trees only when he gets his licence, and by the time the licence reaches him it is about the 25th or 26th September. The duty of the department is to see that the number of trees for which he makes his application are marked in time, so that he may be enabled to draw toddy from these marked trees to begin his work on the 1st of October. In these circumstances, it is the duty of the department to enable the renter to tap the trees marked, and it is the duty of the Sub-Inspectors to go to the trees and have them marked ready so that they may be tapped on the very day or even on the previous day. Now, most of these trees are not marked at all till the 7th or 8th October. In the meanwhile, most of these renters go and tap the trees before they are marked and the Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors connive at the irregularity as a matter of course. I wish to point out to the House that the above interval gives a lot of room for corruption on the part of these Sub-Inspectors and when a renter complains that he is not enabled to start his work till the 10th or 12th October because the Sub-Inspector has not arranged to mark the trees, the supervising Inspector orders the prosecution of this renter (complainant). He does not use his discretion. The supervising Inspector, as soon as he gets a report from the Sub-Inspector that such and such a renter ought to be prosecuted for tapping the trees before they were marked, sanctions the same, and *ipso facto* the prosecution is begun. The supervising authority ought to use his discretion as to whether prosecution ought to be started or not. He does not use his discretion at all, and this goes a long way to justify the inference that the supervising Inspector also connives at the bad practice to share in the resultant profit. It is only to bring this fact which appears to be very common all over the Presidency to the notice of the hon. the Minister that I have brought this motion."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I am very glad that the hon. Member has brought this fact to the notice of the House. I will always be glad to inquire into such matters. In this connexion, I may inform the House that when a similar practice was brought to the notice of the Government, two Sub-Inspectors were dismissed immediately. The existence of such practices makes efficient supervision necessary and for that purpose it is that this demand is made. If any irregularity on the part of the subordinates is brought to the notice of the Government, the Government will be very glad to attend to it."

MR. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI:—"Sir, in reply to what the hon. the Minister said, I would like to make one remark. When any complaint is made, it is the Sub-Inspector or some other subordinate who is punished; whereas the real source of the irregular practice is not taken to task. I request the hon. the Minister to see that in such cases the whole chain of the Excise Department is called to account. Since I have the assurance of the hon. the Minister that he will do his best to put a stop to these irregularities, I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.



[13th March 1923]

## MOTION No. 34.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—" Sir, my motion is—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,000 for the special pay of five Inspectors.*

Sir, I do not think this is a local allowance for being posted to unhealthy places. I want to know why this allowance is given."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, this sum of Rs. 3,000 relates to the special pay of Rs. 50 each to five Inspectors. This special pay is sanctioned on account of the arduous nature of their duties, and has been allowed for a long time in the case of the Central Office people. The Retrenchment Committee considered this question and recommended the grant of a presidency allowance of Rs. 50 each to the First and Second Assistant in the Board Office and a duty allowance of Rs. 50 for the Excise Inspector of Railways. They declared that the last-named officer was not eligible for the presidency allowance. This recommendation of the Retrenchment Committee is under consideration."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 35.

Mr. S. MUTTUMANIKKACHARIYAR :—" I beg to move the motion that stands in my name—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for two probationary Inspectors.*

As the department is already over-manned I do not see any necessity for two probationary Inspectors. It is for this reason that I have moved for this reduction."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, these Inspectors, or probationers, are taken directly to the service in order to infuse fresh blood into the service so that they may bring in more energy and thoroughness in the work of the Inspectors, who are promoted from the bottom of the grade and who by the time they reach the Inspector's grade become worn out. Therefore, in order to have some fresh blood and more energy introduced into the system it is necessary that we should have this recruitment. We continue this kind of recruitment in the interests of Indians. The complaint has been made that we have not been recruiting Indians as much as possible. This is one of the ways in which opportunity for direct recruitment is given to promising and energetic Indians. If the House wants to close the door to such energetic people, then it is for the House to consider how far it is a wise step to take."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 36.

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI :—" Sir, my motion is—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,47,200 for pay of officers by Rs. 1,11,600.*

This allotment is for the pay of one Secretary to the Commissioner, three Deputy Commissioners, eleven Assistant Commissioners, etc. I think the establishment is very large. Anyhow, as the hon. the Minister has promised to investigate the whole question I do not want to say anything."

13th March 1923]

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I have already submitted to the House that the whole question of reorganization will be taken up on receipt of the reply from the Government of India."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 37.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" The motion that stands against my name runs as follows :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,07,900 for 99 Assistant Inspectors by Rs. 69,300.*

Sir, I formally move for the reduction of this allotment for Assistant Inspectors. After the assurance that has been given by the hon. the Excise Minister, may we ask him not to fill up the vacancies that may arise during the year so that when the Salt and the Abkari Departments are separated, there will be room for reduction, as probably under the new scheme we may have to do away with some of these officers? It is, therefore, desirable that vacancies are not filled up until the final scheme is decided upon. I would ask the hon. the Minister whether he would not accept our suggestion not to fill up the vacancies until the above proposal becomes final."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, there is one great difficulty in fully accepting the hon. Member's suggestion."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I only said 'as much as possible'."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I have no objection to give effect to his suggestion 'as much as possible'. The difficulty is that the distribution of these 99 Inspectors runs thus :—The major portion of it, viz. 61 Assistant Inspectors, are in charge of salt factories. Salt being a central subject we cannot interfere with it at all. Of the rest, 22 Assistant Inspectors are in charge of ganja stores, and these again are absolutely necessary. Fifteen Assistant Inspectors are working in distilleries. As hon. Members know, in the case of distilleries, we want officers of this grade to be in charge of stores and godowns, and to check the issues. This is a responsible work and we want responsible officers here. If there is anything above and beyond all these, I shall certainly enquire into the reasons as far as possible."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 38.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I beg to move that—

*The allotment of Rs. 2,50,000 for travelling allowance be reduced by Rs. 50,000.*

This item is found on page 46 of the Budget. It has nothing to do with the fixed travelling allowances to Sub-Inspectors for which an allotment of Rs. 1,81,195 has been provided. Therefore, so far as this item is concerned, it leaves the large body of Sub-Inspectors, numbering over 900, practically untouched. I take it that this item of travelling allowance which is put down here at Rs. 2,50,000 is for the rank and file of officers above the rank of Sub-Inspectors who number about 200. The question for the consideration of the House is whether it is desirable or prudent to set apart the large sum of 2.50 lakhs for the purpose of meeting the travelling allowances of these 200 officers. While I have no desire to completely cut down the



[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

[13th March 1923]

travelling allowances, my motion, if accepted, will have the effect of cutting the travelling allowance by about 10 or 15 per cent. I submit that it will be possible for the hon. the Excise Minister to issue definite instructions to the officers above the rank of Sub-Inspectors to limit their touring so as to bring about the reduction I plead for. Thereby we shall be enabled to scrape a fairly decent sum of Rs. 50,000 this year."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I beg to say that the allotment for the travelling allowances of these officers has been reduced by Rs. 20,000 from that of last year. It is with very great difficulty that this has been done. In a matter like the administration of the Excise Department, hon. Members will remember that constant travelling and constant supervision are necessary; and just now, as the hon. Member from Anantapur has pointed out, it is necessary that supervising officers should move about more frequently in order to see that nothing irregular is done by these subordinate officers. It is absolutely necessary that these people should be travelling about and see that no illicit distillation or trade is conducted by the subordinates. Not only that. In the case of Assistant Inspectors and Inspectors, they have to be paid very high allowances because they have to go about all sorts of places where they can get no supplies whatever. I must say again that this item of travelling allowances has been examined and it has been reduced by a sum of Rs. 20,000 as against last year. Hon. Members will now see that I have effected economy in this matter."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 39.

12 noon.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 47,000 for rewards.*

Turning to page 47 of the Budget, we find that the amount allotted for this item in the Revised Estimate of expenditure for 1922-23 is Rs. 41,000. According to the Budget Estimate the amount of expenditure that was allotted under this item for the year 1922-23 was Rs. 47,000. Now an attempt has been made to carry on this figure of Rs. 47,000 for the year 1923-24, and this comes under the head of 'rewards'. I take it that these rewards are intended for spies and informers. I am not much enamoured of this system. It is true—and I am conscious of it—that this system has been going on for a series of years; but that is hardly a justification for us to allow it to continue. No question of prescriptive right should probably arise with respect to a system which is by no means good or equitable. Moreover, this system of rewards will, I fear, offer much premium to unscrupulous people to get up or concoct cases. Viewed from this standpoint, I venture to think that this will have a most pernicious effect upon the system itself, and through the system upon the people at large. It is only to bring out this aspect of the question I desire to make this motion, and I hope and trust that the hon. the Minister in charge of Excise will consider this matter."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I may say, Sir, that this question is also being examined by the department. Recently, when this question came before the Retrenchment Committee they proposed that instead of granting rewards for each and every individual case, a register might be kept for a whole year and the total amount of rewards found out for that year. This system would prevent officers, as my hon. friend has pointed out, from being

13th March 1923]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

over-zealous for making out cases because they do not get rewards immediately. In any case it will be a restraint on their doings with reference to the detection of crimes, as otherwise they go on without any control. The Retrenchment Committee is examining this matter and as soon as they have finished their labours, I will go into this question carefully and do whatever is possible."

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I shall not pursue this matter. I beg to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 40.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for purchase of tents by Rs. 10,000.*

It seems to me that it is not necessary in the coming year 1923-24 to purchase tents for Rs. 20,000. In the year 1921-22 the amount that was allotted for the purchase of tents was Rs. 42,797. In the current year the amount that has been allotted for the purchase of tents is Rs. 14,000. It is proposed now again to purchase tents in the coming year 1923-24 for Rs. 20,000. No doubt tents are necessary particularly for officers who are employed in the Excise Department. But the tents that were once purchased should last for several years, at least for five years, and I do not think there is any reasonable necessity to allot so large a sum as Rs. 20,000 in the coming year under this head, after having purchased tents for Rs. 42,000 in 1921-22, and for Rs. 14,000 in 1922-23. I do not want to cut out that item altogether. But certainly it seems to me not necessary to purchase tents for so large a sum as Rs. 20,000. I therefore move that a reduction be made."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, this provision is made only to replace those tents that have become worn out and have gone to pieces. Tents that were purchased five or eight years ago have to be renewed. In some years we require more tents and in some less. My hon. friend will admit that the officers in this particular department will have to go to places where there are no bungalows or other conveniences, and it is necessary they should have tents with them. In the year 1919-20, the amount allotted under this head was Rs. 26,000. In the year 1921-22 it was Rs. 42,000, because we required a larger number of tents to be renewed that year. These tents are renewed or replaced year after year. After much scrutiny the estimated amount of Rs. 20,000 has been allowed to go in the Budget. In these circumstances I am sure my hon. friend will be satisfied that this amount is necessary and I trust he will not press his motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 41.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,50,000 for petty construction and repairs by Rs. 50,000.*

It will be noticed that the amount that is allotted is for petty construction and repairs. Yet we find huge sums allotted for this purpose year after



[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu] [13th March 1923]

year. In 1921-22 the amount spent was Rs. 2,60,014. In the Revised Estimate for this year we find the amount that was spent was Rs. 2,75,000. In the Budget Estimate for the year 1923-24 we find the amount allotted is Rs. 2,50,000. I do not know whether petty construction and repair works should cease to exist by the 31st March every year automatically, for if construction of some buildings has been made in one year, I expect this work will continue for some years, and the repairs once made, I submit, must last for some considerable time.

“ Under these circumstances, I do not know what these petty constructions and repairs are for, so that we may lay out large sums of money year after year under that head. I submit that we may as well forego a portion of these petty constructions and repairs and may reduce the provision to the extent of Rs. 50,000.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ This allotment relates entirely to Salt. There is nothing in it concerning Excise. The amount that will go towards petty construction and repairs is for building houses for peons and petty officers, and also for construction of roads from the factories to the main roads and villages. The amount that is required is entirely for the Salt Department and not for the Excise.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ Does it not include also any construction of buildings for distilleries ? ”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ It does not include.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 42.

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,97,000 for total contingencies by Rs. 1,00,000.*

There was a good deal of discussion and bargaining last year in connexion with this question, and the hon. the Minister for Excise was willing to make some curtailment on the whole ; and there is no reason why he should not do so now, more especially that the Salt Department, as has been said, is going to be taken away from the Excise. Now, as regards the question of rewards, the one kind of reward is that which is given to informants, and the other is that which is given to persons who prosecute cases successfully. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar referred to the rewards given to informants and pointed out that they were quite unnecessary, and the hon. the Minister in charge referred to those that are given to the officers. Now, as regards rewards to informants, I think there are enough of factions in our villages which always take care to make complaints to the officers concerned about crimes or anything that occurs in their villages. So there is no necessity to continue the system of having informants and rewarding them for their services. As regards rewards to officers, there is no reason why they should be given any rewards. It is their duty to find out cases and prosecute them successfully. The question of allowance to officers may be explained away by saying that they do more arduous work and so on. I do not know why officers should be given rewards who are expected to do their duties in the ordinary course of their

13th March 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

business. Whenever persons are prosecuted and sentenced, simply because the officers press for heavy fines being imposed on the culprits, it is no reason that a certain percentage of fines should be given as rewards.

“One other point I wish to add in connexion with the allotment for petty construction and repairs. The reply of the hon. the Minister was to the effect that that provision was entirely in connexion with Salt which was a Central Subject. I say that is the very reason why we should not vote for such sums. If the Salt Department is going to be taken away by the Government of India, why should we be asked to vote for sums which are required for the expenditure in connexion with that department? I think, so far as this item is concerned, we must ask the Central Government to defray that expenditure. But so far as the two items under the head of contract contingencies and non-contract contingencies are concerned, I think we may have some reduction made, and I have no doubt that the reduction of Rs. 1,00,000 which I have asked for is very little when compared with the amounts that are proposed to be spent under these two heads. I hope the hon. the Minister will be able to make some reduction so that we may avoid further discussion on the matter.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“The expenditure to be incurred is under the following heads. First, as regards the non-contract contingencies, there are charges for registration, charges for despatch of gunny bags, charges for carriage of stores, charges for repairs of machinery, charges for the preparation of statistics, for mounting maps, atlas-sheets, for copying judgments, batta for prisoners and witnesses and increase in postage and freight charges, etc., etc. Under all these heads this amount is distributed and hon. Members will see that not a single item has been over-estimated. It is not possible, I submit, to estimate accurately under all these heads. Charges under these items for previous years are taken into consideration and the allotment for the next year is made on that basis, and hence a lump provision is made. Taking into consideration the charges that were budgeted for non-contract contingencies for the years 1919-20, 1920-21 and 1921-22, this provision made for the year 1923-24 is not very large. As for the charges for petty construction and repairs, these charges do not at all concern the Excise Department and therefore do not at all come under the provincial head. We are not at all anxious that these charges should be met from provincial revenues. They will be met by the Central Government, as the Salt Department will form part of the Central Government in future. I hope my hon. friend is now satisfied and that he will withdraw his motion.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“I am not at all satisfied with the explanation of the hon. the Minister in charge of Excise. I do not know exactly what the Minister means when he says that the whole of the charges for petty construction and repairs will go to the Central Government. It is said in the note in the Budget on the particular page dealing with this item that two-thirds of the entire cost will go to the Provincial Government and one-third to the Central Government. If I am wrong, I shall be very glad to be enlightened.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“So long as we have a joint establishment, things should go on as they are. What we are endeavouring to do is to separate the establishments. As soon as we separate them I may assure the hon. Member that I will collect every pie from the Government of India that is due to us. In the meanwhile he wants



[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[13th March 1923]

to stop all work. That means that we cannot manufacture any salt this year. For instance, the boats cannot carry the salt if the channels are not cleared of silt. If he is going to ask us to stop all work of that sort he will deprive the country of salt."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I will still say this: if we do not spend much money on this we will induce the Central Government to come to a decision very soon. With these words I withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

### MOTION No. 43.

Mr. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—"I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 29.07 lakhs for Excise by Rs. 1,00,000.*

I may say at the outset that the reduction of 10 lakhs in the agenda is a misprint for one lakh. As it is, the Excise Department has many sets of supervising officers. So many supervising officers means so much travelling allowance, this allowance and that allowance. If it is confined to the officers alone I would not object. Every officer means a lot of people along with him. If he is a supervising officer he should have persons to assist him in his work, and he should have a number of people to carry on the transport work. Therefore, unless the number of supervising officers is reduced, I do not think any useful purpose will be served. For instance, if a supervising officer comes to Negapatam, his servant has to go to Adirampatnam, a place at a distance of 18 miles, for fetching grass to the horse of the supervising officer because his horse will not eat the grass grown at Negapatam. Such things lead to a lot of inconvenience. If the number of the supervising officers is reduced such things will not happen.

"There is another thing. It has been said that our Minister has been able to do away with a lot of corruption in the other departments under his charge. As he is dealing with some departments successfully, it is all the more reasonable why he should deal successfully with this department also because there is so much corruption going on. The only thing I am sorry for is that he takes up only one department. I may also say this. If the head of the office is to be very strict he has sometimes to be very cruel also. That is why I am sorry. I think the Minister would do well to abolish the supervising officers. That will be the only way of saving money and meeting the deficit. With these words I hope the Minister will accept this motion."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I thought that this Excise department had been getting on very well and that this was one of the very efficiently-managed departments. But I am surprised to hear the serious charge of my hon. friend. If there is any such thing as the horses of the officers at Negapatam not eating the local grass, I think it is a case for medical inspection, or the Finance Department should see how far these officers should maintain their horses. I have not heard anything like that till now, and if there is any such thing I think it is a case for investigation. But that does not at all justify the cutting away of one lakh from the total grant. The cutting away of one lakh will not cure the evil. If there are any tangible facts that he wishes to bring to the notice of the Government I shall undertake to investigate them. Every department will be inquired into

13th March 1923]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

and therefore I will inquire into this department also. He does not suggest anything in support of the motion, and I hope he is not going to press this motion.

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 44.

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 29·07 lakhs for Excise by Rs. 1,05,000.*

We are thankful to the hon. the Minister, Sir, for having informed us that he still stands by the ideas he advocated from his seat when he was on the opposite bench, viz., that these intermediary officers are not useful and as such he would take all possible steps to do away with them as soon as possible. However, I think, that it is not always desirable to force him just to omit particular items of the demand. Therefore it would be convenient for him to adjust himself if we reduce something from the total grant. During the three days of general discussion on the Budget we have shown how the hon. the Ministers and the hon. the Councillors have not been willing—at least have not shown any inclination—towards retrenchment. As has been pointed out by other hon. Members, the retrenchments so far effected have only been in the case of the menials and clerks. Coming to this item of expenditure, I would draw the attention of the House to the expenditure under this item during the three pre-Reform years. In 1917-18 we spent Rs. 18,04,000; in 1918-19 we spent Rs. 20,08,000; and in 1919-20 the amount was Rs. 22,46,000. Coming then to the three years after the Reform we see that the total expenditure comes to 30 lakhs 47 thousand in 1921-22; 29 lakhs 45 thousand in 1922-23 and 31 lakhs 41 thousand in 1923-24. Therefore, Sir, it is clear that the expenditure under this head is growing very rapidly. The second thing I should like to bring to the notice of the House is the increase of non-votable items under this head."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" You are speaking of the non-votable items. I do not think we have anything to do with them."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" It is only a total grant, Sir. I am just showing the enhancement so as to show the spend-thriftiness."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Spend-thriftiness in the non-votable items is not relevant."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I submit to your ruling, Sir. I would, therefore, suggest that at least the expenditure that we incurred in the year 1921-22, that is the first Reform year, which amounted to 30 lakhs 47 thousand, might be adhered to. Even this year we have not been able to relieve the tax-payer by retrenchment. I therefore request the hon. the Minister to reconsider and agree to the modest reduction of one lakh and five thousand."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I wish my hon. friend suggests to me out of the abundance of his love the methods by which I can reduce the Budget items. If he considers that any particular item is extravagant, I shall be very glad to consider it. My hon. friend pointed out that the Budget item was increasing every year. That is due to the time-scale of pay given to the officers which has been introduced at the request of the public, and my hon. friend is one of those who joined in the agitation."



[13th March 1923]

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" May I know whether it is due to the increase of pay or the increase in the number of high officers ? "

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" The number of officers has not increased very much. The scale is increasing and hence the demand is increasing. He pointed out that the Reform scheme began with 30 lakhs ; but we find that 29 lakhs is the demand for 1923-24."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I may at once inform the hon. the Minister that I have included both the votable and the non-votable items."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I submit, Sir, that the Excise Department is one of the most economically worked departments in the whole of the administration. In this department which realizes  $5\frac{1}{2}$  crores of rupees as revenue to the Government, we are spending only 29 lakhs of rupees as expenditure, whereas on the Land Revenue department which gets an income of about  $6\frac{1}{2}$  crores, we are spending about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  crores of rupees."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" The collection is done by the Land Revenue department." (Laughter).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I am not saying anything against the Land Revenue department. I only say that this department is so efficiently and economically organised. I may say that this is one of the most economically managed departments in this presidency. Only 29 lakhs are being spent on a department which realises a revenue of  $5\frac{1}{2}$  crores of rupees. Imagine the tremendous work done by this department. Hon. Members will certainly agree with me in thinking that 29 lakhs of rupees are nothing when compared with the revenue of  $5\frac{1}{2}$  crores of rupees that this department realises. My hon. friend has said that some reduction in the staff is necessary. Here is a statement giving the reductions that have been made in the staff. This refers to the year 1921-22. From this statement, we find that previous to this period the total number of officials employed in this department was 8,000 and odd. The total number of officials now in employment is only 7,300."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" May I know, Sir, how many Indian officers and how many other officers have been removed ? "

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Except the Commissioner and the Secretary who are non-votable, the rest are all Indian-recruited."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I am sorry, Sir, my question has not been answered. How many Indian officers have been removed ? How many posts held by Indian officers have been abolished ? "

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I shall be glad to give the details to my hon. friend during the lunch hour. But I may say that the total number of officers has been reduced, viz., from 8,000 and odd to 7,000 and odd."

SAIYID MUHAMMAD PADSHA SAHIB :—" Sir, I do not think that the hon. the Minister for Excise is justified in taking refuge under the fact that his department is more economically worked than other departments. The point at issue is this : whether even in his department there are not still possible avenues of retrenchment which are not yet explored. As has been pointed out time and again and also during the discussion of this morning, there are

13th March 1923] [Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib]

a number of ways and means shown to the hon. the Minister in charge of the department as to how best further reductions can be effected in his department. The hon. the Minister has said that there has been a reduction in the number of officers. But may I ask him, Sir, if that statement is not a deceptive sort of thing—I mean likely to mislead? Do not petty officers, sub-inspectors and peons come under this category of officers? As a matter of fact, if we refer to the note put up by the Secretary, we find that all the reductions that have been effected have been in the cadre of petty officers, sub-inspectors and peons. Every time the Budget came up before this House, there have been demands made from every part of this House—from every section—that Deputy Commissioners, Assistant Commissioners, etc., should be removed. But some excuse or other is put forth every time. Last year, it was said that the times were not quite suitable, that there was some trouble, that these Deputy and Assistant Commissioners were very responsible officers and that they were required for the purpose of bringing life, energy and all that sort of thing to the department. All this is now gone. To-day when we ask for a reduction of these officers, we are told that some proposals have been submitted to the Government of India. These are the ways in which the demands of this House are slighted. The hon. the Minister is not justified in finding fault with the hon. Members of this House, who have asked for reductions of grants, for not showing the particular way in which the reductions ought to be effected. They have suggested every possible method by which reductions can be effected. I think it is highly desirable that some reductions should be made."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya:—"Sir, I am very thankful to the hon. the Minister for Excise for having told us about the extravagance of the Land Revenue department. It is for the hon. Members of this House to note the split in the camp. Apart from the merits and demerits of the Land Revenue department, which it is not my province to discuss here, I would implore the hon. the Minister to accept this and other similar motions which suggest the ways and means. He has told us that I have not shown him any directions in which he can make the retrenchment. I believe that my hon. friends who have spoken before me have indicated different lines in which retrenchment can be effected; and all of them, to my knowledge have withdrawn their motions only on the assurance that the hon. Minister would take them into his confidence and see how far he could retrench. I now implore him not to retrench too much under peons and lascars and not to add to the number of the fat-salaried officers. I hope, however, that, when the hon. Minister comes before the House next year, he will come with a lot of savings. With these words I beg leave to withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 45.

MR. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU:—"Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 29·07 lakhs for Excise by Rs. 46,188.*

This amount includes also the pay of two Deputy Commissioners, which subject has already been disposed of. The remaining sum of Rs. 10,188 is the house-rent allowance proposed to be given to the Assistant Commissioners, etc. Out of eleven Assistant Commissioners, eight have been recommended for house-rent. The corresponding officers in the Police department are not



[Mr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu] [13th March 1923]

given this house-rent. These Assistant Commissioners have their headquarters in large cities, where they can get comfortable lodgings. I do think, therefore, that any house-rent is necessary to be sanctioned for these officers."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, the question of house-rent allowance for officers is under investigation by the Retrenchment Committee. This is a very important question, and there have been proposals made from time to time on the housing of officers in the city or outside—how best we can afford facilities for them in order that they may live at least comfortably while discharging their responsible work. Hon. Members probably know that in the mufassal there is a very great inconvenience for the officers in securing proper accommodation. In rural areas the difficulties are great and often times the officers have pressed upon the Government for providing them with suitable accommodation. Proposals have been placed before the Government as to how far Government can remove the difficulties of these officers. The whole scheme of housing the officers is under the consideration of the Government. They are prepared to pay house-rent. The Retrenchment Committee is considering which of the officers are to be provided with housing accommodation. As soon as the report of the Committee is in our hands, I am sure these Assistant Commissioners about whom reference has been made will share the same fate as other officers in the several other departments."

MR. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU:—"I beg to withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 46.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 29.07 lakhs for Excise by Rs. 100.*

The hon. the Minister for Excise has just now stated that this department is the most efficiently and economically managed department of the Government. There is a serious difference of opinion about that matter. He himself has admitted more than once in the course of this day that the department is not, at any rate, the most economically administered department. Whether he means by his statement that the other departments are more extravagant, I do not know."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I do not insinuate that."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"If he means that, I have no quarrel with him. It is for the other Executive Members to take him to task.

"Then he said that for the first time to-day he heard about corruption in his department. There, again, I am sorry to note how little he knows about the department. People who have been taking any interest in the matter, would have found large numbers of people selling intoxicants on the roads, and in several places the licensed places were licensed merely in name. I am sure several hon. Members in this House will bear me out with personal experience on this matter. Of course to draw attention to this was not the intention with which I sent notice of this motion. My intention was to speak with reference to what has been done in the department hitherto.

13th March 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

“It is now two years and three months since this Council was formed. What progress have we made in the matter of changing Excise administration? Well, opinions may differ on this point. But I am sure opinion is practically uniform that limits on drinking are absolutely necessary, even if total prohibition is not to be our aim as some of us want. What has been done towards this end within the last two years and three months? I beg to submit, Sir, that practically nothing has been done. During the last two years and a quarter we had great opportunities of doing something in this line. There was an awakening; there was opinion in the country in favour of total prohibition; and any Government, Sir, which is interested in the welfare of the people ought to have taken advantage of that feeling in the country and ought to have utilized it in bringing out some improvement in the Excise administration. But, unfortunately, we have not been able to do anything at all.

12-45 p.m. “Last year I pressed this question in this House and I obtained the promise that the whole question would be looked into and something done very soon. I tabled a motion in this House for bringing this matter into prominence again. The hon. the Minister for Excise was pleased to agree to the appointment of a committee, but while I was speaking on the motion some technical objection was raised, and the motion was disallowed. I expected, Sir, that he will carry out the promise of appointing a committee to bring about some desirable change in the administration of Excise. We find a publication issued under the authority of Government to all Members of this House, and in it, what is being done by the present Government is supported, and we are asked to infer that the best that can be done for the administration has been done, and that there is no possibility of a change for the better.

“Then, Sir, a deputation was sent to the North, and though it is some months now since their report was submitted, nothing has yet been done. Only yesterday, in answer to a motion of mine, the hon. the Minister for Excise replied that the report was in the hands of the Advisory Committee, and that nothing could possibly be done in the course of this sitting or in the next two months, in the way of improving the administration of Excise. I do realize that the hands of the hon. the Minister have been full for the past few months, and he has been doing a lot in reorganizing the whole Education Department. But I cannot understand how there can be any excuse for not having taken any action whatsoever in this department. I should like to know what he is going to do within the next few months, and whether anything like a formal decision on the matter is likely to be brought before the Council when it meets next in July. We are almost at the fag-end of our term, and it is extremely desirable and necessary that we should arrive at some decision on a matter of such vital importance as the drink problem, before we dissolve. I have tabled this motion for the purpose of knowing definitely what has been done, and what is going to be done, in this matter, hereafter.”

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, my object in tabling this motion is to draw the attention of this House to the Excise policy that has been pursued by this Government, and also to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister for Excise to the urgent necessity for the adoption of a bolder policy of temperance reform than has hitherto been adopted by Government. I was all the more impelled to table this resolution on account of some



[Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar] [13th March 1923]

remarks that fell from the hon. the Minister during the course of the general discussion on the Budget. Replying on behalf of the Government, my hon. friend, Mr. Patro, said :

What I do say is that the information which I have placed before you will lead one to the conclusion that prohibition and local option are not at all possible in our country.

Sir, if that is to represent the considered attitude of this Government with reference to this question of excise reform, then I must say that we have got indeed a very gloomy picture painted before us. I should rather think that in giving expression to this view, my hon. friend, Mr. Patro, was reflecting the official or bureaucratic opinion and suppressing within himself the opinion of Patro, the social reformer that once existed.

"Sir, even considering the general finances of the country, I must say that the whole financial system of our province is something like a cripple walking on crutches, because more than 33 per cent of our revenue is derived from Excise, and the impression is abroad that we are not alone in this sorry plight, but the other provinces also are at one with us. In this matter the other provinces are not in such a sorry plight as we are. The revenue from Excise in the United Provinces,—I am quoting from the Revised estimates for 1921-22, is 160 lakhs; in Bengal, it is 181 lakhs; in Bombay, it is 330 lakhs; and in Madras it is 481.52 lakhs. So, it will be seen that our revenue from Excise is practically three times as much as the revenue derived from this source by the United Provinces. It cannot be denied that my hon. friend, Mr. Patro, has, during the last two years, taken a good deal of pains to arrive at some conclusion as to the exact policy to be adopted by Government, and the definite steps to be taken to give effect to that policy. But, unfortunately, he was drifting into the official groove when he said :

The policy which I must respectfully commend to the House for its serious consideration is the reduction of consumption by the steady enforcement of enhanced taxation, the immediate objective being a uniform and high rate of excise duty.

If [my hon. friend is under the impression that he can bring about the desired temperance reform merely by means of enhanced taxation, then, I am afraid, he cannot in the least achieve his object. Already, the incidence of taxation in Madras is far higher than it is in other provinces. In Bengal, it is Rs. 11-11-9 per proof gallon; in Madras, it is Rs. 13-5-5 per proof gallon.

"I am, therefore, of opinion that so far as we are concerned we have reached the maximum level in regard to pressure of taxation. And it will interest my hon. friend Mr. Patro to know the opinion of some of the American experts on this point. In one of the pamphlets of the Anti-Saloon League of America, they say :

Demand licence, low, medium and high, has been tried in every conceivable form, and the restraining hand of the law has been laid heavily upon the traffic almost everywhere; yet, has the blight of the traffic continued to fall on our people until the whole church and the electorate have each alike felt the deadly sting of its touch?

This device of enhanced taxation and forcing up the price of liquor has been tried in America, and they have come to the conclusion that they had not the desired effect in bringing about that temperance reform which we have all so much at heart. Sir, we in this country are talking a good deal about the formation of public opinion in the electorate and our bowing down to that opinion. I may confidently say that if there is one point on which public opinion has been formed in this country, and that in no unmistakable

13th March 1923] [Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar]

terms, it is on this question of excise and temperance reform, and I trust that this House and the Government will fully realize the strength of that opinion."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" Mr. President, I beg to submit an observation or two upon this very vexed question. In a way, I consider it rather unfortunate that I should have come in as a sort of interruption of the eloquent speech of my hon. friend, Mr. Shanmukham Chettiyar.

" Sir, just now, we have been asked to hug ourselves on the consideration that from excise we derive the largest income possible. Certainly, Sir, we might congratulate ourselves upon this achievement with the reflection, 'so small a bait, so large a haul.' Sir, are we to sit content, contemplating with complacency the receipt from this source of so large a revenue, or does it also afford food for some other reflections? Sir, the income is, no doubt, enormous; but shall we be satisfied with only thinking of its enormousness, or shall we be permitted to ask whether it involves also a certain measure of enormity? The other day, I was reading a book in which I found one startling observation. Discussing a certain question, the writer, in order to indicate the irrelevancy of an argument, said, 'this is like applying to a practising lawyer considerations of conscience'. (Laughter.) Sir, I do not know whether I shall be held responsible for similar irrelevancy if I sought to apply to high policies considerations of morality, private or public (Hear, hear). But trusting that I shall not, for the time being anyhow, be ruled out of order on that score, — I shall invite the attention of the House to one or two moral considerations.

" I remember, Sir, to have come across, years ago, in the course of my reading, a certain ancient precept of this land, relating to the best method of levying taxes. That precept said, 'He alone is a wise ruler who raises revenues from the people as a bee gathers honey from flowers, without injuring the strength, without impairing the charm.' Will it be permissible, Sir, without being at all disloyal or in any way fanatical, to ask whether or not this revenue derived in so large a measure, does in view of two considerations—namely, from people of what sorts and conditions does the bulk of it come, and in return for what services rendered or what benefit conferred do we make this demand—involve to a most depressing extent this threefold misfortune: namely, enfeebling the economical stability, injuring the physical stamina and impairing the character charm of a large section of the community? If, Sir, there is no irrelevancy in that consideration, then we have to ask ourselves whether any modern civilized Government, in this twentieth century of grace is doing the right thing in drawing this large revenue from the pockets of such people. Sir, there is a contribution to be made by this Presidency to the Imperial Government to the extent of 385 lakhs a year. We have unanimously decided that it is an impost, and we have as unanimously settled that it shall always be characterized as an 'iniquitous impost.' Sir, bearing that fact in mind, how shall we characterize this impost which

1 p.m. comes to five crores and four lakhs net; all that drawn from the people as Excise revenue? Sir, is it permissible, therefore, to ask whether Government is doing, that which will commend itself to the people as a system of a civilized administration or whether it is doing a thing that is likely to tempt the people to think of it as a questionable system of administration? If the criterion, to which I have made reference,



[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [13th March 1923]

set by that ancient precept of the country, has to be accepted as a valid test, shall we be permitted to inquire whether, with reference to this particular department, we shall consider the revenue as either a shining star or a murky blot upon the escutcheon of British Rule in India?

"That is my first observation, Sir. The second that I beg to submit is this: The hon. the Finance Member, in that very justly applauded speech, noted for its lucid exposition and for its mastery of detail, observed that our excise revenue had recovered on account of the cessation of the Gandhi agitation. No doubt, Sir, as a statement of the immediate situation, from the financial standpoint, it is accurate enough. But all the same, perhaps, it will be permissible to remark that it would be nearer the mark to say that the counter-effort of the Government has in this direction successfully resisted a very widespread popular agitation, though unfortunately misguided in several respects. The reason why I mention it is this. I am second to none in this House either in rejecting the spirit or regretting the methods of the non-co-operation movement. Certainly, Sir, the non-co-operation movement as such was neither laudable in its aim nor wise in its methods. But at the same time, Sir, true statesmanship would be failing of that insight into, that living touch with, the reality of things if it fancied that, in this particular respect, the nation, as a whole, stood by Government, not because it was opposed to the methods of the non-co-operator, but because it was also altogether averse to some of the inner spirit and purposes of the non-co-operation movement. Sir, though in all other directions the non-co-operation movement might be judged an utterly undesirable thing, yet in this one respect relating to the excise policy of the Government—notwithstanding all aberrations, notwithstanding all extravagances—it could rouse the imagination of the people because it went direct to the heart of the nation, and appealed to the long-cherished national ideal of total abstinence. No doubt it is quite easy to refer to the praise of the *soma* juice in the *Vedas*, to catch at innumerable allusions to drink in our *Epics* and our *Puranas*, and to indulge in the pleasantry of making a present to us, temperance reformers, of the chapter on the Superintendent of Liquor in Kautilya's *Arthashastra*. But, all the same, Sir, the fact remains that through all these centuries, in spite of the vicissitudes of ages, one great ideal has had an inseparable hold upon the sentiment of the country, namely, the firm adherence of the best thought and the finest spirit of the nation to the ideal of total abstinence. As an index to that spirit I may refer to a verdict of old Manu himself, who was inclined to place in the same category of the five great sins, the *pancha mahapathakas*, *surāpanam* and *guruwanganagaman*, the drinking of liquor and the seducing of the guru's wife, that revered person whom we are taught to reckon as one of the five mothers of a man. That shows the measure of disgust and repulsion with which the better part of the nation viewed this evil of drink, and that attitude has remained quite unchanged notwithstanding the changes, political and social, that have come upon this country. That typical modern Indian, that pattern of a patriot, Mahadev Govind Ranade, said on a certain occasion that, to the normal Indian, temperance meant only, and nothing but, total abstinence. To an Indian, therefore, Sir, temperance has no other meaning; it denotes nothing other than total abstinence. Why I seek to lay stress upon this point is that on this vital question there seems to be an almost irreconcilable difference between the view-points of the Government and of the better section of the public. I may state that

13th March 1923] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

difference in the language used by Abraham Lincoln on a particular occasion, that is, whether the evil lies in the use of a bad thing or whether it lies in the abuse of a good thing. The nation has said that the evil lies in the use of the bad thing; but the Government have said that it lies in the abuse of the good thing. There is the contrast—the antagonism between Government and the people. Sir, we have had the hope that with the change in the system, with the inauguration of the Reforms, with the installation of a ministry composed of the representatives of the people, this antagonism would rapidly disappear and the Government view-point would be brought into line with the view-point of the nation. But I find, Sir, after two and half certainly very busy years, we are told at last that the high-licensing system, which has been hitherto in vogue, is the only salvation for the country. Sir, I am anxious to lay stress upon this. The sentiment that I have already referred to, the sentiment that is current in the higher strata of all communities—not only the Hindus but Muhammadans as well, and I hope, also Christians—has to be reckoned with. According to this sentiment, might I say that the distinction drawn between licit and illicit drink is absolutely meaningless? As the Telugu proverb says: నా చెంబులో పానీ నీళ్లు; నీ శంఖులో పానీ తీర్థము. The difference between licit and illicit drink is a purely official finesse in which the popular sentiment has no share. Sir, I may note that this distinction, with the popular sentiment, has as much meaning as the distinction between licit bigamy and illicit bigamy to a truly typical Britisher nourished in the traditions of monogamy. In the one case, bigamy, licit or illicit, is an evil that should be rooted out, in the other case drink, licit or illicit, is a monster that has to be eliminated. Unto this sentiment which is widespread and which, in the renaissance of India, will be rehabilitated as one lofty national ideal, unto this sentiment, again, that formula to which one's attention is drawn so often, namely, maximum revenue and minimum consumption, that formula is entirely wooden, absolutely apathetic, altogether unconvincing. That formula, Sir, will, unto this national sentiment and the resulting judgment, appeal as little as a formula that sought to relieve the anguish of the sorrow-stricken heart over the Malabar Train Tragedy—the formula: maximum numbers, minimum space. Therefore, Sir, I venture to urge that a change must come; that Government must be prepared to adopt another standard. Our Government should not fight shy of this good chance. If progress has to be made, if the nation as a whole has to advance, the best thought, the finest sentiment and the noblest aspirations should be installed both as the censor and the guide of the nation; and as the thinking, the feeling and the resolute sections of the community demand abstinence, this reform shall be achieved. With these words, I beg to support this motion.” (Cheers.)

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“Sir, if I intervene at all in this debate, it is because I feel very strongly that the excise policy now pursued by the Government is causing untold misery to thousands of families in the country. My work, Sir, takes me very frequently to the rural areas and brings me into very close contact with the common people and it is a very pitiable sight to see the daily ruin, the daily misery these families are subjected to by this curse of drink. And the worst of it is that the Government do not seem to realise the gravity of the evil. They are very apathetic and very indifferent in regard to the bringing about of any measures for the benefit of these people. This Council has now and then in no unmistakable terms



[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [13th March 1923]

indicated to the Minister that the evil called for urgent relief. One of the very first things that the House did was in August 1921 to table a resolution for reducing this evil. And the Minister then agreed to appoint a committee and to refer the question for their consideration and also to be guided by the advice that the committee may offer. He promised to appoint a committee in August 1921 but took several months to appoint it and even then he never cared to refer this question to the committee for consideration. So that in March 1922, I was obliged to refer to this matter in the following words: 'What has the Minister done to put down the drink evil? He makes a lip profession that he is as anxious as anybody else to promote temperance. But what has he done or propose to do.' In the course of the reply to these observations the Minister said as follows: 'I have requested some leading persons in the matter to meet together, discuss the pros and cons of it and advise Government. I have requested Sir Charles Todhunter, than whom there is no one in India who has worked more in the excise administration to be kind enough to take the chair.' He continued: 'Even though the drink revenue falls our aim must be that people must improve and grow morally and physically. With that principle in mind, I am bringing about a committee in order that a national policy may be evolved for the province.' Now, Sir, did he carry out the assurance then given by him? He proposed to appoint a representative committee and appoint the hon. the Finance Member as the Chairman. Did he take any initiative in that direction at all? Or did the members whom he proposed to appoint decline the honour offered to them and refuse to serve on the committee? That was in March 1922 and many, many months afterwards, he appointed two people, one a member of this House and another an official to enquire into this question. They gave the report without any delay whatsoever. That report again did not come before the House for a very very long time. In the course of the general discussion on the Budget this year, I referred to the matter and in reply the hon. the Minister said that this report had been placed on the table and had been given to the Members of the House while as a matter of fact nothing of that sort had been done. It is only three days ago that that report was circulated. So I am feeling justified in charging the Government with indifference in this matter, with lack of earnestness in carrying out any reform in the excise policy. And I think, Sir, this is a position which none of us can ever for a moment countenance and it is up to us to force from the Minister a positive declaration of policy and to see that it is carried out."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, I feel that I am in a position of great disadvantage, after the most magnetic influence that the House was placed under, after the speech of my revered friend Diwan Bahadur Venkataratnam Nayudu Garu. Any attempt that I may make to explain the position would fall flat upon this House after the very eloquent, charming, spirited and almost spiritual address that he has delivered to this House. I do not at all differ from him nor disagree with him in the noble and high sentiments which he has placed before us and which the House and the nation should pursue in the matter of temperance reform. I have absolutely no quarrel whatever with all the principles that he has enunciated in order that we may adopt a policy of temperance reform in this country. But my difficulty is that we are under a system of administration, and it is that system of administration that we have got to reform and to modify, so as to be carried on in accordance with

1-15 p.m.

13th March 1923]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

the wishes of the public. Therefore, I submit that there is no antagonism, as far as I am concerned, between what the policy of the Government should be and what the wishes of the people are in this matter. I have already stated in a note submitted to the Standing Advisory Committee on Excise that 'by all means let the revenue go but let the people improve and let us work towards that end.' How we are to work towards that end is the thing which I am seriously considering. I think every right-minded man would agree that we cannot sweep out the whole system at once, nor can we revolutionize the administration. It may rightly be asked what steps have been taken in the direction of reforming the present system. I have already submitted to the House in my general remarks on the budget the steps that were taken in the matter of excise reform. I submitted that, first of all before any change is effected or any step taken in the matter of reform we have to make sure that that step is a step in the right direction, and that the policy and the method we may pursue would lead to the end we have in view. That end should be not merely to wipe out the excise revenue, it should also be towards reforming the minds of the people. It is towards that end that we are to work, and as the high licence system which I advocated has been discouraged or criticized in this House, I may be allowed to say that the high licence system has been adopted preliminary or preparatory to prohibition in America. One of the authors of an American book on Temperance, one who has worked for over thirty years in America on temperance reform, Dr. Guild, has stated in that book which relates to the popular control of drink problem, that the high licence system is one of the surest means of leading the opinions of the people to ideas of temperance. That is what he found after all his experience, and that is what he found not only in one State in America, but in several States. I shall refer only to one or two extracts from that book in order to show that the principle we have adopted here, and which I had indicated in the note I submitted to the Committee on Excise, is not one arrived at without any consideration or investigation into the matter. The author above referred to also says that the high licence system that prevails in America has led to the closing of the saloons. But in the pamphlet on saloons read by my hon. friend, Mr. Shanmukham Chettiyar, the view was propounded that the high rate system did not do any good to the people there. But on the other hand here is a reformer, an author who has got 30 years' experience and who worked on this question, and he gives it as his opinion based on experience that this high licence system is one of the surest ways of leading to temperance and the abolition of saloons. He says that although year after year it was found that the high licence system was improving the conduct of the saloons, as a natural consequence, drunkenness was rapidly diminishing. That is the experience of this reform in the United States of America. Again, he says that the high licence system is the method most desirable for large states where restrictive measures do not work at all, and that it is the only effective form of control as demonstrated by experience. This is the recorded experience of one who has devoted himself for the work of temperance reform in the United States, and he states that the high licence system is the only effective form of control as demonstrated by experience. He also says that it may be applied to places where prohibition and local option would both fail, and it reduces the number of public houses within measurable limits both as to number and as to geographical situation. He further says: 'Although perhaps strictly a fiscal matter, the high licence



[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[13th March 1923]

system improves temperence . . . etc.' I do not want to tire the House with quoting the many other passages contained in the book written by this author. From his experience of the working of the high licence system in America, he says that it ultimately led to prohibition in certain States. Again, prohibition as understood by us and prohibition as understood in America are entirely different. I do not want to reiterate what I already submitted to the House during the general discussion on the budget. With regard to prohibition, or with regard to local option, there are different standards and varieties adopted in other countries. The methods vary from country to country. Therefore, to study the conditions of our province, and see what would be the best means by which we would be able to achieve our object, is the thing for which we have to work. In order to find out the particular means to be adopted, we have instituted inquiries as to what has been done in other provinces, and the report given by my hon. friend Mr. Shanmukham Chettiyar and Mr. Strathie, bearing on that matter, is very interesting. They have enquired what has been done in other places and they have given us their views and experiences. There is difference of opinion in regard to one system, namely, the rationing system that has been introduced recently in Bombay, and I am watching that attempt in Bombay with great interest. If we find that the rationing system in Bombay is working on really good, sound and practical lines, I would not have any objection to adopt it as far as it is applicable to the conditions of this province. Here the high licence system and the rationing system may be combined and worked as far as they suit the conditions of this province. My hon. friend Mr. Shanmukham Chettiyar prophesies that the rationing system is the surest way to prohibition, and he may be correct in his prophecy that that system may lead to prohibition in the long run. I am not at all differing from him in that matter. But let us judge of the matter in the light of our experience and the local conditions in which the system is to be applied. And when once we are sure of our ground, I am quite sure we shall not be behind Bombay in applying the principles of the rationing system to the conditions of our province, as far as they are applicable or suitable. Therefore, what else can the Government do in the matter? The Government, the reformed Government, or the popular Government that has come into existence, cannot, in a day, revolutionize the whole system that has been worked for so many years. It cannot alter the conditions and circumstances that have ruled the country for so many years. The administration has been sound and efficient; I am not at all against any attempts to modify the old policy or to suit it to the altered conditions here. But we have to investigate, we have to work up the details of the methods, and then adopt a plan and a policy to achieve the end in view. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that before we can achieve the end, we must examine the ground on which we stand, and it is for that purpose I say that we are investigating the conditions in this province. A questionnaire has been published and it is sent out to all persons interested in temperance reform; their views will be considered with great consideration; and after the committee finishes its work and makes its recommendations, then the Government will adopt the suitable policy. When all the details have been worked out and a scheme and plan formulated by the committee and submitted to the Government, then the Government will surely review the whole case and they will then formulate a policy. At present, I submit, we are not behind any other

13th March 1923]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

province in the matter of temperance reform. The report of Messrs. Shanmukham Chettiyar and Strathie will show that in the matter of the surcharge system or in the matter of the fixed fee system, or the system of licensing boards, we are not at all behind any other province, and perhaps, if I may repeat again, those policies have been adopted in this province long before the other provinces adopted them. I would not by any means rest satisfied because we have been doing something in the matter. We have to do more, and it is the anxious desire of the Government to see how that can be done and on what lines. I may assure my hon. friends that if any constructive suggestion would come from the committee after their deliberations are over, we are quite prepared to consider the whole matter of revising the entire excise policy in this province."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I am told that the Government have been really doing something in the matter, and I hope that they will pass their orders according to the considered opinion of the Excise Committee. With this further hope that the whole consideration will be over before we meet again in July and that the matter will be placed before the Council, I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The demand for the grant of Rs. 22·07 lakhs under Excise Department was then put to the House and carried, and the grant was accordingly made.

The House then (1-28 p.m.) adjourned for lunch.

## DEMAND III—STAMPS

The Council re-assembled after lunch at 2-30 p.m. with the hon. the Deputy President in the chair.

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant of Rs. 5·85 lakhs under Demand III—Stamps. The details relating to the total demand will be found on page 4 of the printed list."

## MOTION No. 47.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANCAR :—"Sir, I move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5·85 lakhs for stamps by Rs. 1,000.*

I have tabled this motion to raise the question of swadeshi in stamps. The question is not a new one, Sir, and it is not known why we should still continue to get stamps manufactured in England. India is now capable of manufacturing many things. We are able to have our own mints where all coins are minted, and I believe there are a number of art presses throughout the country which are able to print very useful things. There is, therefore, no reason at all why we should have our stamps manufactured in England at a very large cost. The question was recently raised in the Central Government but no satisfactory solution has been arrived at. We only find the usual evasive reply, that the matter is under consideration. This matter, we are glad to see, is provincial as well as votable in this province. Therefore, I want to know whether this Government is taking any steps whatever—the point was raised by me last year—I want to know whether this Government is trying to get locally-made stamps either in this Presidency or from anywhere else in this country. I suppose the old theory that Indian manufactures are not good has been exploded, and I think that



[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [13th March 1923]

the hon. the Revenue Member probably knows that presses in India are now able to turn out very confidential communications and so many other things. I do not think there will be any difficulty whatever to get stamps manufactured in India either in private or Government presses. I, therefore, want to know whether Government has done anything in the matter, or, if not, whether they are going to do anything in the future, so that we may have a substantial reduction under this item in the future."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, it will be comforting to the hon. the mover of this motion to know that we are in correspondence with the Government of India on this matter. First we wished to be sure of the terms of contract entered into by the Government of India with a certain European firm in London for the manufacture of stamps and stamp papers, and we have since learnt that the contract will expire in December 1924. In the meantime, we have started an enquiry with the Government of India as regards the powers of the Local Government to manufacture their own stamps and their own stamp paper and everything incidental to them. After ascertaining all the facts of the case it was only on the 17th February last that a final communication had been sent to the Government of India expressing our views, and I am not permitted, Sir, to either lay on the table or to quote *verbatim* the correspondence between this Government and the Government of India. Until final orders are received, the intermediate correspondence cannot be laid on the table. However, I may assure the hon. Member that this question is engaging the attention of the Government."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I thought that the hon. the Revenue Member was going to give us some idea of the previous correspondence on this matter. We do not want a *verbatim* report nor do we want that the report should be laid on the table. However, I hope that he will bear in mind this matter, although the contract ends only in December 1924. Generally, we are told when any question is raised 'it is too early' or 'it is too late'. Let us not wait for two years till the old contract is over. Let us be sure of what we should do. This Council must make it clear to the Central Government that whatever they are going to do this Government will be, as it were, bound to give the contract locally. With these words, I beg to withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 48.

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA :—"Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5.85 lakhs for stamps by Rs. 100.*

The object with which I have tabled this motion for reduction by Rs. 100 is to ascertain from the Government if they have any intention of improving the status or the emoluments of the stamp vendors. I know that the remuneration or the discount that these stamp vendors have been receiving has been very small, and I understand various *mahazars* have been sent by them requesting the Government to increase the discount. A fear is entertained by these stamp-vendors, somehow, that not only will the discount be not increased but that the Government are going to reduce the discount that is already being paid. I wish to know whether the Government have any intention of reducing the discount, and whether they are prepared to increase

13th March 1923]

[Mr. M. Suryanarayana]

the discount that is being paid to them. It is for this purpose, Sir, that I tabled this motion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, as will appear from the Budget figures, the amount of discount budgeted for during the current year was only Rs. 2.75 lakhs. After the passing of the new Stamp Act it had to be increased to Rs. 3.5 lakhs during the current year, and the same amount has been carried forward in the Budget estimate for the next year as well. Therefore, under this head, it will be apparent that there is decidedly an increased expenditure. This, of course, has attracted the notice of the Retrenchment Committee as indeed it ought to have done, for this is clearly an item in which there is increased expenditure—and the matter is under investigation by them. I am not in a position now to anticipate what their decision will be. Until the Committee have finished their labours I cannot say whether they will allow the present rate of commission to continue or whether they will make a recommendation for the reduction of the discount."

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA :—"I have not asked, Sir, for any assurance. I hope that the hon. the Revenue Member will remember that the discount now allowed is certainly too small, and that he will protest against any reduction which the Retrenchment Committee may propose. I withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The demand was then put and granted and the grant was made.

## DEMAND IV—FORESTS

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 44.16 lakhs under the head Demand IV. Forests."

## MOTION No. 49.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 63,750 for contingencies by Rs. 1,000.*

In this connexion, I may say that I wanted to speak of other things such as the question of village panchayats, etc., besides what I am going to say on this point. So far as the forest panchayats are concerned, I think there will be opportunities to speak on some other motions on which hon. Members are likely to concentrate their attention, and therefore I do not want to say anything on them. I simply want to deal first with the question of the officers of the Forest department. Very well, Sir, we are glad to see that some retrenchment has been made. I suppose the hon. Member in charge will be able to assure us that some more reductions will be made, instead of saying that the matter will be considered by the Retrenchment Committee and so on and so forth, and instead of simply pleading for the existing state of things.

"So far as the question of recruitment is concerned, it is not enough if we are only told what is likely to be done and all that. We have been hearing of so many suggestions which were made by the Chief Conservator and which are under the consideration of the Government. It has been made clear practically by all sides of this House that the pay of the Indian officers need not be so high as the pay of the Europeans. Therefore, I want to know whether hereafter the pay of Indians recruited either in India or in England



[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [13th March 1923]

will be fixed differently from the pay to be given to Europeans. On this question I do not want to say much. But there seems to be a little difference among the various Imperial officers in the various departments regarding the pay of Europeans and Indians. On a previous occasion, when I referred to the Revenue Department, the hon. the leader of the House challenged me by saying that all the Indians in the same grade as the Europeans were given the same pay as Europeans so far as the Collectors and Sub-Collectors were concerned. I did not have the Quarterly Civil List then. But since then, I have got a copy of the Civil List, and I find that it is not correct to say that the Indians get the same pay as the Europeans are receiving. Here I see that the Indian Collectors get far less pay than European Sub-Collectors. I will refer, Sir, if necessary, to the page in the Civil List—page 29. In the Agricultural Department, the Indian Imperial officer is started on a lesser pay than the European Imperial officer. For instance, the Indians are started on Rs. 350 and they go on getting some increments annually, whereas the Europeans begin on Rs. 500. Equal wages for equal work 'may be a good principle.' But still, from the point of view of economy, it is necessary that the Government should fix a lower scale for the Indians and get more Indians than Europeans. And if it is necessary to get European experts, then they may get them on some contract. So far as this question is concerned, it is surprising to me to see why there should be 26 appointments kept vacant. I am not saying that these 26 appointments should be filled up. But let us be sure once for all that these 26 appointments will never be filled and that there will be no recruitment for them. Just before the new

2-45 p.m. Reformed Council came into existence, the Government for some reason or other thought that their hands would be tied later on and created a number of new appointments in every branch of the administration. If any proof were needed for this statement, the Forest department might be cited. In it several Imperial officers were recruited and their pay was fixed very high. If this recruitment is allowed to proceed unchecked, the Secretary of State might soon double the number of officers. It is high time that the Secretary of State is told that recruits are no longer needed. At present there seem to be 26 vacancies, and it is better that the Government once for all make up their minds not to fill them."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"The motion before the House is to reduce the allotment for contingencies ; and all that the hon. Member is now referring to is not relevant to the present motion."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"These contingencies refer to the contingencies of the Chief Conservator of Forests and as he is the head of the Forest department, we are here discussing the forest policy adopted by the Government. Last year, on a similar motion, I raised the same question of policy underlying the Forest department and my reference was ruled as quite in order."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"I am afraid that much of what the hon. Member has been saying in reference to this motion is quite out of order."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I can only quote last year's precedent."

13th March 1923]

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“ I would request the hon. Member to confine his remarks to the contingencies covered by the motion before the House.”

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ The allotment for the Chief Conservator is a non-votable item. Last year it was ruled by the hon. the President that in moving for the reduction of a clerk in the office of the Chief Conservator of Forests, we could deal with the policy adopted by the Forest department. Following the precedent set up last year, I am discussing the forest policy on a motion to reduce the contingencies of the Forest department. In fact I referred to the very same question of recruitment last year, on a motion to reduce the contingencies of the Forest department.

“ I was saying, Sir, that we have ever been crying for the reduction of the number of officers in this department. The result of our incessant cry is that they have stopped the recruitment of Ranger and the Extra Assistant Conservators. I understand that training is not given now for Rangers and Extra Assistant Conservators, because we have already got enough of such officers. Side by side with the stopping of the recruitment of these lower-paid officers, I want that for some years at least, the recruitment for higher officers should be stopped. The Extra Assistant Conservators and the Extra Deputy Conservators who have been drafted into the cadre of Deputy Conservators as if some special privilege has been conferred on them, now find themselves placed in a very awkward situation. The Imperial officers in all the other departments come under non-votable heads, but in the Forest department, the Indian promoted Deputy and Assistant Conservators who are also Imperial officers come under the votable item. That is why some of my hon. friends have given notices of motions to remove these seven officers.

“ Then, Sir, so far as the Indianization of the Service is concerned, our resolution to reserve at least one Conservator's post for an Indian is still kept in abeyance. We do not know whether before the end of this Council or the end of the Council that is to come shortly into existence, any Indian will be appointed for the post of Conservator of Forests. The usual plea of seniority is often raised against this proposal. It is said that no one can go to the top ignoring the claims of those above him. As I have already said over and over again, these people by reason of their having entered the Imperial service come under a different category. It is impossible for them to live so long as to get over the various people above them. It is only the younger men that are above them and these younger men cannot be expected to retire soon making room for these Indian Imperial officers. I must say, Sir, that in these matters strict seniority cannot be enforced. For instance, there is an officer in the service of the Government of India who is much junior to the hon. the leader of this House and yet the former is drawing over Rs. 6,000 and the latter is drawing only over Rs. 5,000. Therefore, I think it is too much to say that seniority should be respected irrespective of other considerations. I submit that these Deputy Conservators who have been promoted from the Provincial service to the Imperial service can never expect to get a Conservator's post if this principle of seniority is rigorously enforced. If the Government is anxious to respect the unanimous wish of this House, they should appoint at least one Indian as a Conservator of



[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [13th March 1923]

Forests. An Indian would know the Indian forest conditions much better than a European, and it is but bare justice that the claims of Indians should be recognized before it is too late.

"I once more wish to impress upon the hon. Member in charge of this Department the imperative necessity for stopping all further recruitment for the higher offices in this department at least for some years. It must once for all be declared that there is no necessity to fill up the posts which have now been vacant for some time past."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Mr. President, at the outset, I might take a technical objection that my hon. friend, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, has been discussing to a very large extent non-votable items; but I do not wish to insist upon that technical objection.

"The main point to which my hon. friend directed his speech was the general subject of recruitment, that is, recruitment for the higher grades of the service. I do not know whether he is aware what exactly our present position is. It has been decided that for the present, that is, for the next five years, 40 per cent of the vacancies occurring in the Imperial department shall be recruited in India. I am not quite sure how that is going to fit in with the promotion of men from the Provincial service to the Imperial service. I am afraid there may be such difficulties as have already occurred and as have been alluded to by my hon. friend, namely, that men promoted from the Provincial service will be considerably older than those Indians who come in direct. That is a matter which we shall have to face. I am afraid I cannot give my hon. friend very much satisfaction on the question of appointing the promoted Provincial service men to a Conservator's post above the heads of their seniors. I must adhere to the position that in the case of a man who can remain in the Provincial service but who has elected to accept promotion to the Imperial service, it is quite impossible to suggest that all considerations of seniority shall be set aside, and that he shall be put in later as a conservator over the heads of others who are by far senior to him."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"If a man does not elect to go into the Imperial service but remains in the Provincial service, will he get the chance of being promoted over the heads of his seniors?"

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"If he likes, we will cancel his appointment in the Imperial service, and then it is quite possible that he may get the chance of being promoted.

"If we were not promoting men to the regular ranks of the Imperial service I should be quite prepared to consider the question of assigning an appointment of Conservator to the Provincial service men. But we cannot do that as matters stand at present, because the Provincial service men are those who either because of their juniority or because they are less fit have not been promoted. It would be ridiculous to give the post of a Conservator to one of the Provincial service men as they stand at present, while the more experienced Indians who have been promoted to the Imperial service have to wait for their turn.

"My hon. friend referred to the case of Mr. Innes who holds a more important post than some of his seniors in the Civil Service. The fact that he was junior in the list did not stand in the way of his being selected.

13th March 1923]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

Mr. Innes, Sir, was selected as eminently qualified by his merits for the post he holds. No one can possibly object to selection on that ground. What I do object to is the suggestion that selection should depend not on merit but on racial consideration, and that on that ground the officers who have been promoted to the Imperial service should disturb the whole principle of seniority and go above the heads of their seniors. As regards the actual prospect of these officers ever succeeding to the appointment of a Conservator, I think my hon. friend is taking an unduly pessimistic view. On the other hand, the oldest of these seven promoted officers is only aged 43, and above him there are only three officers who have never officiated as Conservators. If we consider the rate at which these officers retire or take leave, the three places will not take very long to go through. It seems to me that the prospects of these officers promoted from the Provincial service being in the run for the post of Conservator are at the present moment very favourable indeed.

“Next, I come to the old question whether we should fill up the posts which are now vacant. We have already taken steps to inform the Secretary of State that there is no need for him to engage any one in the current year. My hon. friend may take it from me that there is no question of the Secretary of State for India suddenly making up his mind to engage half a dozen men and insist on our giving them suitable places. There is an impression abroad that, as regards the men who came last and who are coming this year, they have been foisted upon us by the Secretary of State. On a previous occasion, I was at some pains to point out to the House that it was unfair to attribute any such action to the Secretary of State. These men have to be indented for three years before they actually arrive in this country. Three years ago all of us were under the impression that immediately after the War there was going to be a boom in forest exploitation and forest activities and that we were going to have a large increase in the output of the Forest Department. It is hardly fair to put the whole responsibility on the Secretary of State for having done a thing which we ourselves would have done if we had been in his position. We are now on our guard, and we have written to the Secretary of State that in the present year we do not want any new recruits, that is, recruits who will be available to us three years hence.

“I do not know if there is any other detail which my hon. friend wished me to refer to. On the general question of retrenchment he appealed to my hon. friend, Mr. Richmond, to tell us what he was going to do. I should like to remind my hon. friend, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, that this House has appointed a Retrenchment Committee to go into these matters and it would hardly be courteous to the Retrenchment Committee if Mr. Richmond were to lay his proposals before the House before the Retrenchment Committee has even seen them. All I can say is that Mr. Richmond has been engaged for the last six weeks in overhauling every single item of expenditure in the department. He has now got his data ready and he is shortly to discuss the whole matter with Mr. R. W. Davies. After putting their heads together, they will present their final conclusions to the Retrenchment Committee. But I should not like the House to go with the idea that any very large reduction of expenditure is to be expected in the Forest Department. The obvious reason for this is that by cutting down expenditure in the Forest Department, we shall be restricting the commercial side of our activities. We can economize if we want: we can cut off a lakh



[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[13th March 1923]

here and a lakh there; but this will really reduce our receipts. I have already referred to this view of the matter in this House and it obtains confirmation in a telegram received to-day from Simla. Referring to a certain cut of 4 lakhs made on the expenditure side, the hon. Sir Basil Blackett reminded the hon. Members of the Legislative Assembly that the cuts made by them were not going to reduce the deficit; on the other hand, they would probably increase the deficit by one crore. That is very much the position in our Forest Department though happily the results are on a smaller and less alarming scale. We should remember that for every lakh taken away from the expenditure side, we should deduct 2 lakhs from the receipt side."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, the hon. the Home Member 3 p.m. has referred to the Retrenchment Committee and to the work that is being done now by Mr. Richmond. It would, I think, Sir, facilitate the course of the discussion in this House if the Government would give us an undertaking in regard to one or two points. The first is that Government should carry out the recommendations that may be made by the Retrenchment Committee. The second thing that they should also undertake is that if retrenchments are effected by the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee, they will not utilize the saving realized for other purposes by reappropriation. If an assurance is given on these two points, Sir, I think, it may perhaps simplify matters and shorten debates."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"If that will satisfy the hon. Member, Sir, I am prepared to assure the House that I will try to carry out any recommendations made by the Retrenchment Committee."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"What about the question of reappropriation, Sir?"

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"As regards that point, Sir, it concerns a general assurance which I think I must leave to the hon. the Finance Member."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"We are thankful of course, Sir, for small mercies, and the Forest Department is one of those departments where mercies are very rarely showered. We are very thankful, Sir, that for the present year no more recruitments are to be made. But I do not know what the 'present year' means—whether it is calendar year or financial year."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"It is calendar year."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"That was what I wanted to know, Sir. Another thing that I want to request the hon. the Home Member is to see that not only recruitments are not made hereafter at any time, but to be very careful not to recruit military officers. In spite of all that has been said, if a person has been a military officer and if he is recruited, I understand that all his previous military service comes to his service in this department, and people who have already been working here before he was recruited become his juniors by the fact that he was in the Military Department and brings back with him to the Forest Department the whole service which he had put in either in the Military Department or

13th March 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

on the fields of war. Therefore, if we really want to improve the status of these people, either Indians or Europeans, I think it would be better to see once for all that no military officers are recruited.

"As to the other general point, Sir, I am very glad that to-day it has been said that if any Indian, either in the Provincial service, or promoted to the Imperial service, is found equal to the task, he will be appointed as Conservator."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I must make a verbal correction, Sir. What I say is that, if there is any one whose merits entitle him to be selected for the post, the fact that he is not at the head of the list will not prevent his selection."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Whether in the Provincial or in the Imperial service. I wanted only to qualify the hon. Member's statement. I think, Sir, that if anybody is found equal to the task—that is how I understood the hon. the Home Member—he will be appointed to the post. Well, Sir, that is a very great concession and I hope that some departmental objections will not be raised against it. With these few words, I beg to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 50.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I beg to move, Sir, that the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for purchase of cattle be reduced by Rs. 10,000.

The Forest Department seems to be the pet child of the Government. We find from page 5 of the Budget estimate that the income has considerably been reduced by Rs. 1,20,000. Whereas, turning to page 9, we find that the expenditure has been increased by Rs. 2,19,500, so that we find that we have got less income and more expenditure. And yet in these days we find an increased provision for purchasing cattle to the extent of Rs. 30,000. The revised estimate under this head is only Rs. 13,000 as against a Budget estimate of Rs. 24,400 for 1922-23."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I ask my hon. friend to point out the item, Sir?"

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I refer to page 51 of the Budget, Sir. The actuals for 1921-22 were Rs. 21,337. If our income is to be Rs. 1,20,000 less than the revised estimate, and if our expenditure is really to be in excess by Rs. 2 lakhs and odd, I fail to understand why there should be an increased provision under this head. Perhaps they may claim that this increased expenditure is responsible for our monthly showers and in fact the very shower that we have had to-day may be ascribed to the existence of forests. I cannot go into that question now, because I am unable to understand the logic of it. Still I wish to know, Sir, why there should be an increased purchase of cattle this year when we are going to get only a less income from the forests."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Sir, it might assist my hon. friend in the discussion of this matter, if I were to mention that out of the provision made for the purchase of cattle Rs. 18,200 is not intended for the purchase of cattle at all. It is money spent in capturing elephants. It is a very profitable business to capture elephants, and I do not suppose that my hon. friend desires to object to our maintaining an establishment for that purpose."



[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[13th March 1923]

"My hon. friend's objection, I take it, is to the increased total. I may tell him that of the increase, Rs. 17,000 represents the cost of replacing buffaloes which were destroyed in the Nilambur division during the Mappilla rebellion. That information, I hope, will be sufficient to satisfy my hon. friend that we are not indulging in extravagance in regard to this matter of purchase of cattle this year; we are merely replacing cattle which unfortunately owing to special circumstances were lost."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I did not know, Sir, that 'capture' meant 'purchase' according to their phraseology. Now I am enlightened upon that point: that purchase includes capture. The question is whether any captures were made during the current year and during the last year. If we were not able to effect any captures, then is there any possibility of effecting any successful captures this year? Therefore, it is only a problematical thing. It is said that Rs. 18,000 have been provided for it and the hon. the Home Member told us just now that Rs. 17,000 are intended for replacing cattle lost in the Malabar rebellion. If that is so, it comes to Rs. 35,000. Still, we have got a provision of only Rs. 30,000 here. This also I am unable to understand. If the hon. Member can effect a cut here, I think it will do some good to the people at large."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I can explain that point, Sir, if I am allowed to do so. The provision was Rs. 43,000, but in the Budget proposed by the Chief Conservator, it is reduced to Rs. 30,000. The figures which I quoted were those given by the Chief Conservator on the basis that he would have Rs. 43,000 to spend. This, I think, Sir, will explain the apparent discrepancy."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I do not press my motion, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 51.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, I move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,86,645 to remove timber and other produce by Government agency by Rs. 50,000.*

The amount spent under this head last year (i.e., 1921-22) was, as is seen at page 51 of the Budget, Rs. 4,13,909. In the current year, i.e., 1922-23, the amount under the revised estimate comes to Rs. 5,18,000. For the coming year 1923-24 the amount provided is Rs. 5,86,645, that is, an increase of nearly Rs. 70,000. Out of this increase of roughly Rs. 70,000 for the next year, I move for a reduction of Rs. 50,000, leaving an increased amount of Rs. 20,000 over the revised estimate for the current year.

"It may be stated in answer to this motion, Sir, that the larger the amount spent under this head, the greater will be the quantity of timber that the Government will be able to remove from the forests and therefore the greater the amount that will be realized also. No doubt this argument may hold good in some cases, but it cannot certainly hold good proportionately to the increased figures. I believe Government spend about Rupees 5,36,000 and odd for removing timber and other materials, and they will be able to substantially realize the same amount which they will be able to realize by spending this Rs. 5,86,000 and odd this year. In fact, after a

13th March 1923]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

series of deficits there is no need to unnecessarily spend this amount this year. For these reasons, Sir, I move for a reduction of this amount by half a lakh."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I am not quite sure, Sir, whether I rightly understood my hon. friend's closing remarks. He appeared to say that he was quite certain that Government by spending Rs. 50,000 less than what they proposed to spend, would still make the same total profit. Well, Sir, I do not know whether my hon. friend has special information regarding the prospects of the timber market which is not at my disposal or whether he speaks merely from intuition. But I find it extremely difficult to accept his suggestion which would falsify the whole of our experience. These figures of expected receipts and expected expenditure have been put down after a detailed experience of many years; and I am entirely at a loss to understand why my hon. friend should still suppose that, in the coming year in particular, this transaction is going to be a much more profitable concern than it has been in the past. His main object, I gather, was to restrict our operations. Why, I am not quite sure unless it be that he would like to take this opportunity of reducing the deficit exposed in our whole Budget. I have already mentioned, on a previous occasion, that any cutting-off of money from this source will not reduce our deficit, but will, on the contrary, increase it. I think perhaps that that is a sufficient answer to my hon. friend's suggestion.

"If I may trouble the House with one or two details in support of this provision, I will read one or two extracts from the notes of the Chief Conservator which explain how he proposes to utilize this sum of Rs. 5,86,645.

"He proposes to spend Rs. 66,500 on the exploitation in the sixth circle. There he expects to find 50,000 c.ft. of timber. He anticipates 3-15 p.m. that the sale of that will bring in Rs. 1,20,000, a profit of nearly 100 per cent. He proposes to exploit 17 thousand cubic feet of timber in Wynad at a cost of Rs. 95,000, and the revenue anticipated is Rs. 2,95,000. Here, again, there is a clear gain of Rs. 2,00,000. If my hon. friend wants to cut off that project, we shall lose Rs. 2,00,000. Similarly, at Mount Stuart it is going to cost us Rs. 84,000 to carry out the work of exploitation contemplated and we expect a return of Rs. 2,50,000. This, again, is another 2 lakhs to be cut off from our receipts if my hon. friend's cut is to be effected. I hope that after these detailed explanations, my hon. friend will not press his motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"My hon. friend was quite right in his assumption that my object in moving this reduction is to effect economy. He went on to state that by reducing this amount we will not be able to reduce our deficit, but, on the other hand, we will be only increasing it. I was not quite able to follow his remarks. However, I do not wish to press my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 52.

Mr. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR:—"Sir, the motion that stands in my name is

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 18,22,350 for conservancy and works by 1 lakh.*

My object in tabling this motion was to urge the speedier substitution of the contract system in place of departmental working in all possible



[Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar] [13th March 1923]

ways. Hitherto, the nature of work seems to be first to work departmentally, and then, after undergoing a lot of trouble and expense, to give it on contracts or auctions. No doubt, the latter system is in many places found to be causing serious losses to the contractors also and hence the fuel and timber prices have been abnormally high, similar to the evil effect of auction system under Abkari. It is preferable to adopt a system of contract instead of auction. It is on account of the department undertaking that work we find that the net income from Forests does not justify the expenditure upon the department. As we are going to have Forest Panchayats in large numbers, it will facilitate still further the contract system and it may gradually be arranged that more work is given to non-official agency on contract system in the ordinary way or in the form of agreements where special circumstances require them. In this way a gradual transference of such works may be done from the official to the non-official agency.

"It is an admitted fact that Government agency is always costly and wasteful. Since the policy of the Forest Department, therefore, is admitted to be most expensive, I do not think there will be any difficulty in accepting my motion. No doubt the hon. Member in charge of Forests will be pleased to say that the Government will always avail themselves of such cheap working agencies wherever they find. But what I do want to impress upon the House is that Government should, instead of continuing departmental work in areas where, according to them, people are not found to take contracts, induce contractors to undertake the work, giving all possible facilities. Then only more persons will be found to come forward for taking contracts. In such areas, if better officers with more responsibilities are posted, I think much of the departmental working may be speedily replaced by the contract system which alone will bring in more revenue with less cost. If any expenditure on a large scale is included in the allotment of expenditure on account of any undertakings based on scientific investigations, exploitations, experiments and developments works, etc., such expenditure may be very safely omitted or reduced to a minimum under the present circumstances. I am afraid there is a tendency now-a-days to place very high hopes in adopting scientific methods in everything—as if we have exhausted our brain energy and practical experience which have withstood successfully for generations. It is quite possible to show a large increase in certain areas worked by Government. The reason may be quite different and we cannot be justified in allowing the practice to go on, for, in working large areas containing valuable timber, it is quite easy to show a profit. But we must take into consideration, leaving aside the value of the produce, whether the outturn of work under Government agency shows a profit in proportion to the amount spent or not. As I have already said, it is bound to be a loss when viewed in a business-like way."

Mr. R. D. RICHMOND :—"Sir, the proposal of the hon. mover is that the whole work of exploitation, which is now done by the Forest Department, should be entrusted to contractors, the arguments advanced in support of that policy being that the expenses would be cheaper and the profit to the Government greater. If we look into the figures at first sight, it might look like that. Under 'Conservancy and Works', in the accounts for 1921-22, on one side there is a sum of Rs. 19,45,002, and you find very little or nothing on the other side. One must not judge from that. Those who think that exploitation work might be left entirely to contractors would

13th March 1923]

[Mr. R. D. Richmond]

do well to consider the expenses of the contractors also in the matter of felling, carting, sending by train and marketing of timber. It remains to be proved that the contractor, after incurring all these expenses, would still make a greater profit than Government. When the systematic working of the Forest Department was first started, it was done by departmental agency down to the felling and carting of timber. I may say that it has been the policy of the Government to entrust to contractors as much of this kind of work as they possibly can. I have got the figures from 1913-14. In the year 1913-14 the revenue made by departmental exploitation of firewood amounted to Rs. 1,46,000. Our final figure in this respect for the last year is Rs. 57,000. It is clear therefore that the Government is pursuing this policy of entrusting to contractors works of this nature.

"As regards timber, the matter is rather difficult. For, it is difficult to find men with the capital and with the knowledge necessary to carry on extraction in the less accessible areas in which we now have to work. Were these men forthcoming, I have very little doubt, the Government will be only very glad to entrust the work to them and thus save the Government from the necessity of producing accounts. But they are not forthcoming and they have not got the knowledge and the necessary capital. So, until they are forthcoming, it seems to me only fair that the Government should carry on this work. In America the work of exploitation of forests is entrusted to private agency. There are people there with the necessary capital and skill. For my part, I think that the exploitation work carried on by Government agency would pay better. It is one of the questions over which there is much difference of opinion. If the department is going to be regarded entirely as a commercial concern, then we shall have to revise our establishments and do firewood business only. I do not advocate this policy, and I am not convinced how we could make more money by so doing. In this connexion, I would quote Madura as an example where the Government supplied fuel to the people in the hope that prices might be reduced. I hope it is not intended that the Government should do this kind of work. So, as regards timber, the moment that contractors are forthcoming to take up this work and pay us the price for the wood they may undertake to work and fell, then I have little doubt that Government will be prepared to hand it over to them. At present they are not forthcoming.

"Another means of interesting private parties to work out the forests is this: the Government should enter into some form of profit-sharing with private parties, whereby the Government should be prepared to supply the capital that is necessary and the private parties should undertake the working out of the forest produce. This system has been tried in the Punjab to a certain extent and when it was introduced in that province, it met with much applause from the public. An expert was engaged in America in connexion with this work, and he was instructed to buy machinery, and Government was responsible only for the capital. The work was conducted by private agency on a profit-sharing basis. I think this House would not be well advised in recommending once for all that we should abandon the policy of working the forests ourselves when we cannot get private people to work them."

Mr. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR :—"I could not follow the hon. Member who spoke last. What I submitted was that an inducement should be made



[Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar] [13th March 1923]

to the people for working out the forests. That would cheapen the work, save the cost of expenditure incurred by Government, and also be advantageous to the people. I submit that a reduction should be made."

The motion was put and declared lost. A poll was demanded 3-30 p.m. by Mr. Biswanath Das which was taken with the following results :—

*Ayes.*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.        | 17. Mr. M. Suryanarayana.                          |
| 2. " T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai.              | 18. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.                 |
| 3. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.         | 19. Mr. Muttumanikkaachari.                        |
| 4. " K. A. Kandaswami Kandar.              | 20. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaacharu.             |
| 5. " B. Muniswami Nayudu.                  | 21. Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. Rama Rao.                |
| 6. " A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar.     | 22. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.                         |
| 7. " M. Narayanaswami Reddi.               | 23. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.                     |
| 8. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.           | 24. " M. R. Seturathnam Ayyar.                     |
| 9. Mr. W. P. A. Saundarapandiya Nadar.     | 25. " T. Arumainatha Pillai.                       |
| 10. " A. Subbarayudu.                      | 26. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas.                |
| 11. " A. Tangavelu Nayagar.                | 27. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai.                    |
| 12. " V. C. Vellingiri Goundar.            | 28. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib.                  |
| 13. " C. Venkata Ranga Reddi.              | 29. Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib.               |
| 14. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.   | 30. Khan Sahib Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib. |
| 15. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.      | 31. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razak Sahib.                |
| 16. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |  |

*Noes.*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter.                | 14. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.  |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Habib-ullah Sahib. | 15. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve.             |
| 3. " the Raja of Panagal.                         | 16. The Rev. W. Weston.                |
| 4. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkataraj Reddi Nayudu.      | 17. Mr. M. Ratnaswami.                 |
| 5. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.                     | 18. Abbas Ali Khan Bahadur.            |
| 6. " Mr. A. R. Knapp.                             | 19. Rao Bahadur M. C. Raja.            |
| 7. " Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar.                   | 20. Mr. L. C. Guruswami.               |
| 8. Mr. E. S. Lloyd.                               | 21. " R. T. Kesavulu Pillai.           |
| 9. " A. Y. G. Campbell.                           | 22. Rao Sahib M. C. Madurai Pillai.    |
| 10. " R. D. Richmond.                             | 23. " P. Venkatarangayya.              |
| 11. " E. F. Thomas.                               | 24. Mr. A. J. Leech.                   |
| 12. " E. Periyannayagam.                          | 25. " A. M. MacDougall.                |
| 13. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.             | 26. Rao Bahadur I. Namburam Chettiyar. |
|   | 27. Mr. A. E. Rencontre.               |

Thirty-one voted for and twenty-seven against

The motion was declared carried.

## MOTION No. 53.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 60,300 for pay of seven Deputy and Assistant Conservators.*

I may point out at the outset that these seven officers are going to be appointed in the coming year, and that they are not now in office. If they were in office, I would not have moved this motion. One of the ways of effecting economy is to cut away the provisions for new appointments; and from this point of view, I submit that there are very good reasons for not appointing these new men. The revenue that is expected to be derived under the head of Forests in the year 1923-24 is Rs. 52,52,000. The total expenditure is Rs. 51,89,000. Therefore you will see that after spending Rs. 51,89,000—I am speaking from the figures that are given for the

13th March 1923]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

ensuing year 1923-24—we shall get Rs. 63,000. This statement itself shows that there is something wrong somewhere. If we go a little more into the details, what do we find? We find, that there are eighty-six officers in the department excluding the seven officers who are to be appointed in the coming year. I am speaking only of the higher officers, namely, the Deputy Conservators and Assistant Conservators, and not inferior men like Rangers and others. I may say that I do not also include officers who are employed in the Forest College. I do not include the office of the Conservator also. Omitting all these, we find that there are eighty-six officers: six Conservators, thirty-seven Deputy and Assistant Conservators, one Forest Engineer, one Forest Utilization Officer, one Chief Forest Engineer, thirty Extra Assistant Conservators, one Lumbering Engineer, five Supernumerary Extra Assistant Conservators, three Probationary Extra Assistant Conservators, and one temporary Extra Assistant Conservator for the development of a particular area. All these make up a total of 86 officers. In addition to these it is now proposed to appoint seven Deputy and Assistant Conservators. It seems to me that this proposal is absolutely unjustifiable. I submit that there are too many appointments already, and I hope I have made out a very good case."

Mr. A. T. MUTTUKUMARASWAMI CHETTIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I have also given notice of the same motion, namely, to omit the allotment of Rs. 60,300 for pay of seven Deputy and Assistant Conservators of Forests.

"This is entirely a new item in the Budget. My hon. friend, Mr. Tanikachellam Chettiyar, in his vigorous speech during the general discussion on the Budget pointed out how the Forest establishment went on increasing from year to year without a similar increase in the income of the department. The only considerable increase is in the fines and penalties extracted from poor ryots. Most of the high grade forest officers are recruited by the Secretary of State, and we in Madras are expected to pay the men dumped on us from above. It is time that we protest against this sort of imposition by omitting the allotment under discussion."

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI:—"I support the motion.

3-45 p.m. I should like to know from the hon. the Home Member

whether these seven Deputy and Assistant Conservators are promoted from the Provincial to the Imperial service, and, if so, why their pay alone is votable. If the answer is that they are promoted from the Provincial to the Imperial I have nothing to say. If they are officers who are to be newly appointed, I wish to oppose."

Mr. S. MUTTUMANIKKACHARI:—"I support the motion."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"I beg to support the motion of Mr. Krishnan Nayar. I also invite the attention of the House to the expenditure incurred which is Rs. 28,61,900 as against Rs. 27,96,000. Of course, it is said that these are new officers to be introduced in the coming year. There is also the personal allowance of Rs. 4,800. For these reasons I support the motion."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Mr. President, it would have saved a considerable portion of the time of the House, if my hon. friends had taken the trouble to listen to the statement made by my hon. friend, Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar, in the beginning of this afternoon's



[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[13th March 1923]

proceedings when he referred to and explained this matter. These seven officers are not new appointments at all. They are Provincial service officers who were promoted during the last two years to Imperial service posts. I am rather surprised that, even after this had been explained, no less than seven hon. Members are proposing to cut the pay of these seven officers. As regards the fact that this item now appears as votable, the decision, Sir, rests with the Accountant-General. The classification is his. We asked him a question on the subject, and he replied that the classification is correct."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I hope that in future preparation of the Budget more care will be taken in classifying the figures. As it is, on page 52 of the Budget we find that for 1922-23 a certain number of officers is given, such as Conservators, Extra Assistant Conservators and so on. Then, as against that column for the coming year also figures are given. Just to illustrate what I mean, the number of Conservators for 1922-23 is given as six. As against that, for 1923-24 the number of Conservators is also six. Then again the number of Forest Engineers for the year 1922-23 is one, and the same number is given for 1923-24. As against these seven Deputy and Assistant Conservators, the column for 1922-23 is blank shewing apparently that these appointments do not exist in the current year, and that they are to be created for the first time in the year 1923-24. Thus, if greater care had been taken in the preparation of the Budget the time of the Council would be better utilized. However, I do not wish to press the motion."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I do not wish to say anything except to repudiate the suggestion that the confusion is due to a careless preparation of the Budget. If the hon. Member had taken a little care to follow the earlier speeches, like that of Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, this question would not have arisen."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 54.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I beg to move—

*to omit the allotment of Rs. 7,000 for one Lumbering Engineer.*

This appointment seems to be a new one for we had no such officer in previous years, and against him we find an allotment of Rs. 7,000. I should like to have information from the hon. the Home Member as to the nature of the work to be done by this officer, the extent to which the State is likely to be benefited by him, and whether the appointment is of a temporary nature or likely to be made permanent. After hearing the answers to these points I shall decide what I am to do with this motion."

Mr. S. MUTTUMANIKKACHARI:—"I support the motion."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I also support this motion."

Mr. R. D. RICHMOND:—"The scheme for developing and conserving the forest resources has been framed in order to increase the revenues. It has been decided to institute a new branch under the Special Forest Engineer. Many of the Members of this House would no doubt remember Mr. Martin who, as the Consulting Forest Engineer of the Government of India, was able to spend a good deal of his time in Madras making his preliminary investigations. As a result of his report it has been decided to go further;

13th March 1923]

[Mr. R. D. Richmond]

that is to say, to carry the investigations further, and in the case of projects for extraction of timber on a large scale which appear to be profitable, to pursue them. The communication by the Government on the subject in G.O. No. 340, dated the 5th March 1923, has been laid on the table and; no doubt, has been received by hon. Members. As a part of the Special Forest Engineering Branch I referred to, the Lumbering Engineer is a temporary appointment for three years. It is not expected that he will be employed for more than six months in the coming year; hence, the provision is only for Rs. 7,000. Mr. Martin cannot undertake the detailed local investigations himself; for, if he were to do it, it would mean that only one of these projects would be examined at a time. Therefore, the idea is that he should go to America and bring back with him a qualified Lumbering Engineer who will assist him in the preparation of logging projects, that is to say, schemes for the extraction of timber on an elaborate scale. He will carry on the technical work in securing the data in these forests, and, where work has been started, he will supervise the erection and the operation of the machinery. The House will understand that few of our own officers are familiar with the use of the logging machinery. Further, this Logging Engineer will assist to train exploitation officers and others in the operation of the machinery in modern methods of forest valuation, and in the preparation of logging maps. These are rather technical matters, but very great importance is being attached to them in America, and we shall be taught the most up-to-date methods. It would of course be possible, and some may think so, to use the Chief Forest Engineer himself for this purpose. As I have already pointed out, to keep a highly-paid official in one place for a particular work without utilizing his services as much as possible is not sound policy.

“There is another point. It is on the advice of Mr. Martin that this Logging Engineer was appointed, and he holds strongly that he cannot do without a Lumbering Engineer. It is even said that he cannot take up his duties unless he has these assistants. As I said, it is not proposed to appoint these officers permanently. It is hoped that we shall pick his brains and be ready to get on hereafter with our own men, both Provincial and Imperial officers, Indians and Europeans alike. But there must be a staff ready and we must have the best advice. In view of this explanation I hope the proposal to reduce this allotment will not be pressed.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, I rise to support this motion and wish to say a few words not merely on the question of the Lumbering Engineer but on the whole question of the administration of the Forest Department. Sir, we are dealing with Forest. Trees grow there, and we can appropriately expect this standard to exist in the Forest Department, namely, that a tree should be judged by the fruit it bears. Now, what is the fruit that this department has borne? Sir, I believe I made a mistake apparently in my calculations made in a very optimistic spirit in my last Budget speech when I said that the profit was about a lakh and fifty thousand rupees—but now, according to the Budget, we find that, after spending Rs. 52 lakhs and odd, we are getting a magnificent sum of Rs. 63,000. It is said that by the employment of this large number of officers we can wonderfully develop our forests, which will be a source of immense wealth to our country. Sir, we had in the year 1920-21 only an army of 27 Assistant Conservators; but now we have 44, and whatever my hon. friend, the hon.

4 p.m.



[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [13th March 1923]

the Home Member, may say that intimation has been sent to the Secretary of State that no more recruitment should take place in England, I find in a book published by the authority of the Government, namely, the Civil List, that with reference to Forest Department, at page 113, under the head of 'Deputy Conservators', there are as many as 41 officers, and items 42 to 57 are left vacant. So apparently the sanctioned strength is 57. In addition to this, a gentleman has been re-employed after his retirement, and there are also two other officers, Forest Engineer and Forest Exploitation Officer. It is only a question of filling up the whole of the cadre, if not this year, next year. Again, Sir, I am indebted to the department which put in my hands a book, apparently for converting us into the belief that forest is a 'gold mine'; I am actually using the expression found in this book. It gives a review of the Forest Department for the past 30 years. We have got in the Budget the figures for 1921-22, 1922-23 and 1923-24. It is curious to find that at the time when the number of these officers was the lowest, the revenue derived was the highest. The highest water-mark was reached in the year 1919-20 when for the first time we got Rs. 25,22,000. Previous to that year it was a small sum. But during the war it was rising gradually and the highest was reached in 1919-20, when there were not so many extra officers. Subsequently, it was Rs. 8,51,000, the amount spent being more or less the same. The next year when we expected a profit, we incurred a loss of Rs. 3,95,000. Sir, in the coming year we are asked to spend about 52 lakhs, and we are going to get a profit of only Rs. 63,000, and this sum of Rs. 63,000 is arrived at after adding the sum of Rs. 2,46,000 which we hope to get by way of fines and penalties. The hon. the Home Member the other day, in the course of his reply to the Budget speeches, said that in Madras they are following a new system of imposing fines on the ryots charged with allowing their cattle to graze in the forests. You stop them going to the magistrate and say 'pay some money to us; we shall allow you to go away.' By prosecutions of this kind probably they are able to compound with these offenders for a very large sum, larger perhaps than the magistrate in the softness of his heart may impose on them. The hon. Member also said that they did not divide the two things separately. I have referred to this last year—to the enormous amounts of fines and penalties that you take from these poor ryots—and I ask whether any inquiry has been made, how much has been the amount of fines imposed by the magistrates and how much by the forest officers themselves. The only difference is this. The accused in the one case stands in the dock but in the other he does not stand in the dock but stands before a ranger or other forest officers who imposes the fines and the total of such fines comes up to Rs. 2,46,000. All this amount taken from the villagers goes to fill up the hollow created by this large army of establishment which yields only a profit of Rs. 60,000. Referring to this and to the fact that it is so hopelessly bad from a business point of view I said that we might as well give up the forest administration. The hon. Mr. Knapp asked whether I was carried away by any feeling when I said this. But may I assure him, Sir, that considerations of prudence, business, habits and reason prompted me to suggest that,—viz., we might as well abandon our forest administration than recover Rs. 63,000 after spending about 52 lakhs of rupees. My business friends here would say that if we put the money in Government paper or in fixed deposits we would be able to get a good deal more. Our friend, the newly admitted

13th March 1923] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiya]

gentleman of the Forest Department, has told us 'Yes we shall have; we shall be creating a valuable addition of which the future generation will have the benefit at the cost incurred by us year after year'. While we were not giving much attention in the shape of appointing Forest officers, Assistant Conservators, etc., drawing a salary of Rs. 550 and 600, we were getting a profit of 25 lakhs of rupees. I think it is certainly a business proposition to leave the forests in charge of a lesser number of officers and allow the forests to grow themselves and give us the revenue or take away from the forests the activities of these officers whose fruits we in our generation will not be able to see but which our posterity may see if we have plenty of money.

"Another question to which I wish to draw the attention of this House is the fact that while we are all protesting against allowances given to officers in various departments, we find that overseas allowances are paid in this department not merely to European officers who are recruited in England but also to the Indian officers. Very often it is said that the European officers find it inconvenient to come over to this country and therefore to make it worth their while to come over to this country, they must be paid some overseas allowance."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I ask, Sir, whether the discussion of non-votable items is relevant? The overseas allowances in this case are non-votable items."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"I hope we are entitled to make remarks at least on non-votable items."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"No, no. The non-votable items have not been laid before the House. Though they are put in the Budget for the purpose of convenience, they are not liable for discussion. But the hon. Member can refer to a non-votable item, not by way of objecting to it but by way of strengthening his arguments."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Thank you, Sir. We find here that several Indian officers are also paid overseas allowances and the *raison-d'être* is not patent. But when I turn to the other pages of the civil list I find that the Indian Civil Service officers who go to England for training and come away to this country do not get any overseas allowance. Well, people who live in our country, who are born in our country and who are bred up in our country but who go to European countries for training—why should they have any overseas allowance? Apparently expenditure does not seem to be a thing which the department concerns itself with. Under these circumstances I support this motion."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I propose to confine my remarks to the motion before the Council. Those who have read the Government Order recently published will find that it contains the report of the Chief Conservator of Forests creating the new department of engineering in the Forest service. Sir, in considering the general scheme of the world supply of timber India's part in it was discussed at length by experts. One of the experts has observed as follows:

India imports Swedish pine, box shooks, boxes and general structural lumber. Her railways are bringing in 1,500,000 treated fir sleepers for experimental use this year from British Columbia and the States, while she has forests of her own, rotting within 40 miles of some of these same railways! A ship-load of lumber is now on its way from Puget Sound to Calcutta while Indian hill forests burn and are wasted to a greater extent than the wasteful



[Mr. T. Namberumal Chettiyar] [13th March 1923]

American lumberman ever dreamed of. Egypt imports 8,000,000 sleepers from Canada. Why not from India, she has the forests and needs the money! Egypt asks for cedar squares from the States—we have the finest cedar in the world here in our deodar forests.

Why?

If India can treble her forest revenue, needs exports to stabilize exchange, desires industrial development to protect her people from famine in years of poor crops, should she not take advantage of this opportunity?

The answer as to how this may be done can be given in three words:—

Education—organization—transportation."

These are the conclusions arrived at by experts. I desired to say a few words

4-15 p.m.

more. There are opportunities for India's expansion in trade and industries, if we follow the conclusions arrived at the various conferences by various experts. Sir, unless funds are provided we cannot do this. Forests are a source of revenue and unless they are used and expert advice is sought and utilized, the revenue from the Forest Department will not be increased. I may refer here to a matter of local interest. Ten or 15 years ago the shares of the Carnatic and Buckingham mills worth one thousand rupees each were of no value. They had no market. Now, Sir, even at thirty times the value there are no sellers. The reason for this is not far to seek. It is due to expert millmen, improved machinery and careful management. If such an expert man as is contemplated by this provision is brought in I do not think we need be so doubtful of the result. Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar observed that whatever we spend now would be for the benefit of posterity."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"May I make a personal explanation. It was not my statement. I only repeated what the Forest expert said, that there would be a reversion."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR:—"In 1844, a Collector of Malabar planted teak at Nilambur, and at the end of the eightieth year the forest is now worth a million of money and the posterity is benefited. I therefore think that we should spend our money ungrudgingly towards developing the forest resources. Some may say that the Chenat Nair forests which have been worked at a loss ought to teach us a lesson not to spend any more money on such ventures. I beg to point out it is not so. On the other hand it is a profitable concern. In the Chenat Nair scheme accounts errors of three descriptions entered; at this stage the bell rang and further remarks were stopped."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I find myself really unable to understand why in this year for the first time this item has been put in. It cannot be said that our present finances are sound. Time will come when we may think of appointing a lumbering engineer. The present time is not quite opportune."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Sir, with reference to the suggestion made by my hon. friend opposite, that the consideration of this matter might be postponed, I think an explanation on that point has already been given by my hon. friend Mr. Richmond, namely, that the Lumbering Engineer is required to work under Mr. Martin and to save that officer's more valuable time by making the detailed investigations for him. Therefore the suggestion that we should postpone the appointment for two or three years will hardly meet our case and the Council must make up its mind to face now the clear issue whether they will or will not agree to the appointment

13th March 1923]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

being created. As Mr. Richmond explained, another of the duties of the Lumbering Engineer will be to train our own men in the work. If we want to get on with our projects, we must have our men trained and to postpone the beginning of the training, as my hon. friend suggests, to two or three years, would be postponing any forest development at all.

• “That brings me to the speech of my hon. friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar. I am not quite sure whether he was here earlier in the afternoon, if he was I should have thought that the information given in a previous discussion would probably have modified his views. But it has not done so. In his opinion, the whole management of the Forest Department is a hopelessly bad business and the best thing would be to abandon the forests altogether.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“The present forest policy.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“I am afraid my hon. friend's change of position—any hon. it seems to me that I was right after all when I suggested that his eloquence had carried him away on the previous occasion—rather takes the wind out of my sails.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“Business considerations. A profit of Rs. 65,000 will be considered as discreditable to any person managing such a business.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“That point was referred to in the general discussion on the Budget. I pointed out that the Forest Department is not solely a business undertaking and the hon. Mr. Richmond has to-day independently made the same statement. A very large part in fact the most important portion of the Forest Department, is connected with protection. I quoted some figures the other day; I fear they have not made much impression on the hon. Member and so I propose to repeat them. There are 11,000 square miles of reserved forests which are required to protect major irrigation works irrigating seven million acres of land in this Presidency. And if, as my hon. friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar suggests, we abandon these forests, we will have to abandon also the irrigation and cultivation. To that extent, Sir, the Forest Department is not and does not pretend to be a business concern, and as I mentioned the other day, if you really want to approach it from the point of view of business, you must divide it into three different sections first, protective, secondly the section which deals with the supply of domestic needs of the ryot, agricultural implements and so forth and thirdly the exploitation side. Until my hon. friend has applied his microscope to the exploitation side by itself and proved to us that we are not only losing at present but are embarking on an undertaking which will continue to be a losing concern, I challenge his right to say that the Forest Department is a thoroughly and hopelessly bad business.”

“I fear I have travelled rather far from the subject immediately under discussion. After the very careful explanation given by Mr. Richmond and the support which I was glad to receive from one Member of the House on the other side, I hope this House will have very little hesitation in accepting this very small item. It has been accepted by the Finance Committee after a good deal of discussion and after receiving the fullest explanation from



[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[13th March 1923]

Mr. Cox himself. If there are any matters of detail in regard to the exact work which this officer has to do on which Members of this House require information I shall in due course be very glad to give it. The whole matter has been laid in detail before the Forest Committee, and to the best of my recollection there was no opposition raised. I hope the Members of this House will be inclined to take its line, first of all from the Finance Committee, which has accepted it, and secondly from the Forest Committee which consists of Members of this House and which has given very careful consideration to this matter."

The motion was put and lost.

MOTION No. 55.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I beg to move—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 5,370 for one Forest Panchayat Officer.*

We were treated, Sir, to a good dose of lecture about the services of the Forest Department. It was said that our criticism of the forest policy does not take account of all the services rendered by the Forest Department. In this motion I am taking into consideration one aspect of the forest administration. I refer to class IV and class V Forests which are needed for grazing purposes. These are forests which do not require any special forest knowledge to maintain them. They are the gifts of nature; anything that grows there grows by itself and without any effort on the part of the forest officers. Time after time, this Council has been saying that these areas ought to be placed in charge of the village panchayats, and the opinion was also expressed that it was not the Forest Department that ought to administer them but the Revenue Department.

"Hitherto, Sir, we were given promises that as early as possible village forests would be formed and village panchayats would be formed to manage them. A few panchayats have been formed. After elaborate inquiry recently as regards the desirability of handing over these forests for administration by the panchayats, I believe the Government have come to the conclusion that the village forests might be handed over. But the Government have not definitely committed themselves to this policy and I think this House ought to insist that it should be adopted. Well, Sir, in the course of giving expression to that view, the Government want to appoint one Deputy Collector with a few assistants to bring the village panchayats into existence. Now, Sir, the area covered by the village forests is very large. It will be impossible for one officer with a few assistants to bring into existence sufficient number of panchayats to take over the management. The result of appointing this limited agency will be that the constitution of the panchayats will be delayed very long. Further, Sir, these forest officers are not keeping themselves in touch with the villagers. They are not people who know the important men in the villages to whom the administration could be entrusted. The Revenue officer is pre-eminently the man who knows the villagers and the way in which the forests can be managed by the villagers. As I said, there seems to be nothing special about these village forests and so it seems to me, Sir, that this extra establishment is quite unnecessary. As a matter of fact this extra establishment is going to stand in the way of giving effect to the policy which we all want to be adopted.

4-30 p.m.

13th March 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

The proper way will be to declare which area will be the village forest to be administered by the village panchayat, then to ask the Revenue officers to form panchayats for the areas. That is the only way by which the panchayats could be constituted early and entrusted with the administration of these forests. This method of having an inadequate establishment is not going to be effective and at the same time will delay the realization of the wishes of the people. On this ground I object to the special establishment and I move for the reduction."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" I support the motion, Sir."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" Sir, I rather hoped that this motion for the abolition of the Forest Panchayat Officer would have behind it the same motive as that which I find lying behind certain other motions on the subject, namely not that the forest inspectors should be abolished but a larger number of officers of the same kind should be appointed. But, unfortunately that does not seem to be the mover's point of view. I take it, Sir, that my hon. friend has read G.O. No. 774, Development, of the 7th June 1922, which was laid on the Editors' Table. It deals with the whole question of the appointment of this experimental staff for the purpose of stimulating the creation of the forest panchayat courts. I say experimental, because although recommendations were made to the Government for the institution at once of the staff all over the Presidency, we erred, as we always do, on the side of caution and restricted our sanction to a much smaller scale and only allowed a small experimental staff. My hon. friend suggests that it is a mistake to try that experiment and that we should hand over the whole work of stimulating the creation of panchayats to the Revenue Divisional Officers. I should like to refer him to the very deliberate opinion on this subject given at page 9 of the Government Order. It is there stated that experience has amply proved that it is no use expecting the Revenue Divisional Officer in addition to his other work to do this duty. It may be that now and then you may get a Revenue Divisional Officer who is particularly interested in work of this nature : such an officer being in constant touch with the people could do a good deal. On the other hand you have the other class of Revenue Divisional Officer to whom out-door work of this kind does not appeal and if a division should be unfortunate enough to have an officer of that kind, we may take it as certain that the formation of the panchayats would make little progress. It is on this ground that it was proposed to put on as an experiment a special officer—he is, as a matter of fact, a revenue officer—with a special establishment to go round the districts which were most backward in the formation of panchayats. That officer was appointed in August last. He took up his duties in October. He was first of all put through a short course of instruction in forest matters for it would be undesirable that he should be set to work without such instruction. He has been studying the matter which was new to him at the time and he has succeeded in forming sixteen new panchayat courts in areas which did not seem hitherto to be very favourably disposed towards the constitution of panchayat courts. In addition, he has already revived several panchayats which had died. That, Sir, is not a bad record of work for so short a period. And I hope the House will agree with me that it would be a very great pity to abandon these experiments before we have had sufficient time to prove whether they are a success or not. The impression that I gathered from the members of the Forest Committee is that it would be better to increase the establishment than to abolish it.



[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[13th March 1923]

But for the present purpose I would only ask the House to allow this experiment which has been in force since October last to continue until we are in a fair position to judge whether it is or is not a success."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"Sir, I have given notice of a resolution for reduction by Rs. 100. The hon. Member, Mr. Knapp, said that my object was to insist on the appointment of more forest panchayat inspectors. The object of Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar is that class IV and class V forests should be handed over to the revenue officials and they should form the panchayats. I think, Sir, there will be no difficulty for the Collector to exercise ultimate control acting under the orders of the Board of Revenue and for the inspectors to act under the Collector. Sir, the matter was discussed before the Forest Advisory Committee last year and all the non-official members definitely stated that in their view that Board of Revenue was the proper authority to constitute forest panchayat and not the Chief Conservator of Forests. The Government Order states: 'Some of the non-official members of the Forest Committee while they generally approve of the proposals are of opinion that it was necessary that the special staff should not be under the orders of the Forest Department. It was suggested that the best course would be to have the Board of Revenue as the controlling authority.' In spite of that opinion, almost unanimous, of the Committee that the revenue authorities, being the persons most closely in touch with the villagers, are the proper authorities, the Government Order declares the Chief Conservator of Forests the controlling authority. The hon. Member said there were three classes of forests, one intended to maintain irrigation projects, another for exploitation purposes and the third for grazing purposes. The Revenue Department, being directly in touch with the agricultural population, should be certainly in a better position to constitute panchayat courts. Therefore, Sir, I should suggest that, if the Government instead of pursuing a forward policy of handing over within the shortest time all the village forests to the villagers either through the agency that they now propose or through the Revenue Department, go on slowly creating panchayats then I think it will be ten or twelve years before the administration passes over and possibly by that time the experiment will be declared unsuccessful and may be abandoned. We are anxious that the forests should be taken over by these panchayats and if the Government lose time in giving effect to this suggestion, it may then be necessary to consider the question of disafforestation. If the hon. Member is prepared to extend the operation of the panchayat in forest matters I should submit that he is pursuing a lingering policy—the present staff would be quite unequal to the task and could not manage it. I expect the hon. Member to make a declaration that he would take the forward policy and hand over the forests to the villagers as soon as possible. If he does so, we would be willing to support him. Otherwise, the present staff, being unequal to the task, could not manage the affair.

"Secondly, Sir, if the forests can be handed over to the Revenue Department it is quite possible to have the tahsildars themselves to act as inspectors; it may be that we will have also the tahsildars' help for the purpose of constituting the panchayats and adding materially to the number of inspectors. For these reasons, I expect the Government to declare a policy of divesting themselves of these forests as soon as possible. Then, Sir, it is curious that while last year there was a provision of Rs. 28,000 for inspectors, this year they have provided Rs. 17,000. If it is a case of higher officers, a

13th March 1923] [Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

larger provision would have been made. But it is a case of appointing inspectors for the benefit of the rural and agricultural classes and hence they ask for less. Is that an earnest on the part of Government to pursue the policy of constituting as early as possible these panchayats? I expected the Government would come with a larger demand if they would adopt a forward policy. Is it the Board of Revenue or the Chief Conservator that should have control? That is the main question. If it is the Board of Revenue, it is open to them to utilize the tahsildars. The number of inspectors that is provided for is absolutely insufficient. About 403,000 acres of land there are, over which panchayats have to be constituted and it would be hardly possible for these four inspectors to extend the Forest panchayat system. More officers should be employed. Then is it the object of the Government to confine the constitution to only class V forests or do they mean to include class IV forests also? The Forest Committee in 1913 definitely stated that class IV forests should also be handed over for a fixed payment. I request the hon. Member to consider the suggestion of mine which was moved in the form of a resolution that in constituting areas to be handed over, non-official agency in each district may be associated with the special officer."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, I just want to say one or two words with regard to the remarks of the last speaker.

4-45 p.m.

My hon. friend agreed that the whole administration with regard to forest panchayats ought to come under the Revenue Department. He also admitted that the very large number of forest panchayats that are required cannot be formed and supervised by the present special agency. These are the two positions from which I argued that this special establishment ought to go. There is the ordinary establishment of tahsildars and inspectors which will be capable of looking after the formation of these panchayats. So we have got the agency already there. We have got in the revenue establishment the superior agency for inspection also. So there seems to be no necessity for an extra agency in the form of these special officers. If you are going to have extra officials like this, the result will be that probably there will be three or four panchayats formed for each district. But the area throughout the whole of the Presidency to be covered by these officers is very large, and unless you are going to very largely increase the establishment, you will not be able to cover the whole Presidency. For both these reasons, it is absolutely unnecessary to have this special establishment, and for these reasons I think I ought to press my motion.

"Then, Sir, the hon. the Home Member said that this was only an experiment. That is just the thing which I should like to oppose. The non-official members of this Council do not consider this as an experiment. They consider that the policy that all these class IV and class V forests ought to be handed over to the villagers should be definitely accepted."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" May I just say a word of personal explanation, Sir. It is not the policy that I said was experimental; it was the method of stimulating the creation of panchayats."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I am glad to hear, Sir, that so far as the policy is concerned, the Government do not recognize it to be experimental. Then he said that it was the view of the district forest officers that the work of the revenue officers was not quite satisfactory. The difficulty is this. The boss of the show is the forest officer. The revenue officer does not care to go and pass remarks on what the forest officer does.



[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [13th March 1923]

If it is a matter of the revenue officer looking after the forest panchayats, he will do it. He is bound to do the work for village panchayats, and he can also be expected to do it in the case of forest panchayats. I may say if sufficient trouble has not hitherto been taken in regard to forest panchayats by revenue officers it is due to this diarchy between the Forest and Revenue departments, and the fact that the boss of the show is the forest officer and the revenue officer's remarks or advice may not be accepted by the forest officer. I do not see that there will be any difficulty if the work is handed over to the Revenue Department. The hon. the Home Member has also said that it is the duty of the special officer to inspect panchayats. How many forest panchayats can this officer inspect? He is only one man, but the forest panchayats are distributed throughout the whole of the Presidency. Is it seriously expected that one officer can go and inspect all these panchayats? It is an impossibility, and unless you are going to entrust the work to the officers in the districts, there can be no proper working out of the policy and no extension of these village panchayats is possible. It is on this ground that I urge my motion that this special officer should go, and I think that the work of organizing and inspecting the village panchayats ought to be entrusted to the Revenue Department.

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"Sir, I am grateful to you for allowing me to say a word on this motion. I just want to say a word against the motion. I am afraid my hon. friend thinks that revenue officials, the tahsildars, will be able to do the work of stimulating and forming these panchayats. I do not think they will do it. From my past experience of tahsildars, I think that they do not take any interest even in checking the accounts of the panchayats. I believe, Sir, that special officers have to be appointed in order to stimulate interest in these panchayats, and then form them. I know as a matter of fact that, soon after the publication of the Forest Committee's report they appointed Mr. Davies, and he did splendid work and started a number of panchayats against the opposition of the Forest Department because they did not want to make reasonable concessions to the people and also against some of the revenue officers. In regard to the formation of panchayats this special officer, Mr. Davies, did much work. So far as other things are concerned, the revenue officers have already got enough of work to do and they will not worry themselves about these panchayats. So, I should like to state that I strongly oppose this motion made by my hon. friend, Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Sir, I do not think that I need detain the Council any longer. I take it that the Council is more inclined to accept the view of my hon. friend, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, than that of Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar. As regards the suggestion made by the former hon. Member that the work of the special officer is too heavy, and that the establishment is insufficient, I do not know if I can take it as an invitation to come forward with a supplementary grant before the end of this session and ask for a reallocation, possibly, of a lakh of rupees."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"That was my suggestion, Sir. We want that the Government should earnestly take up this question."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Then, Sir, I shall be very glad to ask my hon. colleague the Finance Member to consider whether any money is available for the extension of forest panchayats."

The motion was put to the House and lost.

13th March 1923]

MOTION No. 56.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—“ Sir, I move the motion standing against my name which runs as follows :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,900 for six Panchayat Inspectors by Rs. 100.*

“ Sir, one of the objects with which I gave notice of this motion is to elicit from the hon. Member for Forests whether it was not intended to take up a forward policy in the matter of forest panchayats, and I am glad to hear the assurance of the hon. Member that he would try to make the necessary provision.

“ At the same time, I want to raise the question whether the controlling authority in the matter of forest panchayats should be the Board of Revenue or the Chief Conservator of Forests. As I pointed out already, this point was discussed by the Forest Committee, and the non-official members of that Committee were all in favour of the Board of Revenue being the final authority. I need not say anything more in support of that view, but I may just state that the only authority which would take a sympathetic view about the agricultural classes in the matter of forest panchayats would be the Revenue Department. The Chief Conservator is stated to be the only controlling authority, but I may submit that he has not much touch with the villagers, and if the panchayats are worked under the orders of the Chief Conservator, I do not think the villagers would be any the better for it. The very fact that these panchayats have to be started, guided and be made a success, shows that they require much sympathy, co-operation and guidance on the part of the officers, and the Revenue officers possess these qualities. Therefore, in regard to the establishment for starting new panchayats, to fix them and give them all the aid that is necessary, I want that it should be under the direction and control of the Revenue officers, the District Collector or the Tahsildar. They alone know the requirements of the villagers, and they alone can depute the right sort of men to start the panchayats. For these reasons, I want to know whether the Government intend to consider the question as to whether the Board of Revenue would be the more appropriate authority to control these panchayats, than the Chief Conservator of Forests. I understand that a reference was made to the Board of Revenue on this matter, and they said that as it is they would not be able to take up the work, but if they know what kind of Deputy Collector is to be appointed—a long-term officer or a short-term officer—they would be able to state finally. Now, I submit that in the matter of forest panchayats, when a very large number of these panchayats have to be formed, there would not be any objection to a long-term officer being appointed. In such a case the only ground on which the Board of Revenue raised the objection would be easily removed, that is, by appointing a long-term officer.

“ Secondly, I want to raise the question that in the matter of fixing the amount to be paid by the villagers, the non-official agency should be associated with the officer. Last year I tabled a resolution on the subject, and I was told that the matter would be sent up to the Forest Advisory Committee, and that it would be considered by them as soon as that committee is appointed. I do not know what has become of it, and I want to know at what stage the matter is. As matters stand at present the officials fix the amount, and the villager does not know what it is, and he cannot make representations. I know that sometimes very high rates have been fixed, and I have got complaints in my district that very high amounts have been levied. That is why I suggested the non-official agency for deciding the amounts.

“ For these reasons, I move the motion which stands against my name.”



[13th March 1923]

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Sir, I may say at once that I am quite prepared to give my hon. friend the assurance which he desires, namely, that if the Government are permitted they will pursue a forward policy in the matter of developing forest panchayats. The Government are as anxious as he is to decide this thorny question which has been regularly cropping up in the debates of this Council.

"My hon. friend is anxious that the control of this matter should be transferred from the Chief Conservator of Forests to the Board of Revenue. This point was discussed, and the conclusion come to at any rate as regards what I may still call the experimental party now working was that it had better remain under the Chief Conservator. Those hon. Members who know Mr. Cox and the interest he has always taken personally in the matter of panchayats, will, I think, agree that so far, at any rate, as Mr. Cox is concerned, we were very wise in leaving the matter in his hands. Whether after we make our experiment, we may find it better to transfer the work to the Revenue Department is a matter on which I personally have at present an open mind. I can quite understand the reason why this change is proposed. But I would like hon. Members to remember one fact, namely, that there are two difficult qualifications required for dealing with these forest panchayats. The people want a man who is in touch with and in sympathy with the villagers—a qualification which I am glad to find my hon. friend, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu recognizes in the officers of the Revenue Department; but they also need a man with a knowledge of forest work. As I already said, on the question of the control over this matter, I have a perfectly open mind and I am prepared to take it up and discuss it as soon as possible with the Chief Conservator of Forests. I hope that assurance will satisfy the hon. Member."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 57.

6 p.m. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I beg to move—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 24,950 for 31 temporary clerks and 104 temporary servants.*

In doing so, he said :—"I want to know why such a large number of temporary clerks and servants costing Rs. 24,950 are employed. They are all temporary. Whether I should press my motion to a division or whether I should withdraw it will depend on the information that the hon. the Home Member may give."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"The question which my hon. friend puts is as to why it should be necessary to have so large a number as 31 temporary clerks and 104 temporary servants costing so much as Rs. 24,950. The answer, Sir, is that if they were not temporary, they would probably be permanent and then they would cost us a good deal more either directly or indirectly than the Rs. 24,950 which we are now paying. The whole question of these temporary appointments in the Forest Department has been engaging the attention of Government for some months past, and I am glad to say that the number is being reduced. But that is necessarily an economy. If my hon. friend would like to have details, I am quite prepared to give them, but I do not know whether a study of the details will add very much to the information that I have now given, namely, that those posts are temporary

13th March 1923]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

until we are satisfied that it will be necessary to make them permanent and secondly that if we are thinking of economy alone it is cheaper to keep them temporary."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I withdraw the motion, Sir."  
The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 58.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR moved—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 44.16 lakhs for forests by Rs. 100.*

In doing so, he said :—"Sir, my object in giving notice of this motion is to draw the attention of the House to the policy adopted in this department, some matters have already been pointed out in the remarks made by Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar. Well, Sir, the total income from forest is only a matter of Rs. 52.5 lakhs and the total expenditure that has been budgeted for to be spent in India comes to Rs. 51,06,000. So, Sir, the net income, if figures are accepted as they are, will be only a matter of Rs. 1.60 lakhs. Now, Sir, the hon. the Home Member explained that this expenditure was not to be taken along with the income and the two were not to be treated as the budget of a trading concern, but that there were other matters to be taken into consideration. He said, Sir, that the Forest Department was serving several purposes, that there was the question of protection, that there was the question of the supply of fuel and other things, and thirdly that there was the question of exploitation. Well I should remind him that there is a fourth thing also, namely, the question of the grazing grounds which are now under the Forest Department."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"I include that in the second class."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"If they are going to take credit, Sir, for the Forest Department in the matter of the services they do for protection, I beg to submit that the income from the supply of fuel and the supply of grazing has also to be taken into account and the services rendered by the Forest Department for those purposes ought to be separately assessed. If that is done, I should think, Sir, that the last item of exploitation will have very little left to show the result of a business method of administration. Well, Sir, taking the income from the forests, I find the grass and other minor produce from forests worked by Government agency are expected to yield an income of Rs. 54,700, and then again on page 20 of the budget you find that the grazing and fodder grass alone yield an income of Rs. 8.49 lakhs, that is to say, these two items alone yield over Rs. 9 lakhs. Well, Sir, as I said already, these are things for which the Forest Department is actually doing very little. They may say that they are guarding in the case of the fuel forests. In the case of the grazing grounds even this guarding is not necessary, but in the case of the fuel forest some amount of guarding is necessary. But what is necessary for the purpose of guarding will have to be separately assessed. It seems to me that that figure would not amount to a very large one. It ought to be very small indeed.

"As I said, Sir, class IV and V forests are no forests at all, and they should be handed over to the Revenue Department at once with a view to placing them under the forest panchayats. If this is done any expenditure that is incurred on them which, as I said, will be a very small figure will vanish on the debit side and then the huge figure of 9 lakhs realized on this account will also go out. If that goes out, the income will be only a matter



[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [13th March 1923]

of Rs. 44 lakhs and the expenditure nearly 52 lakhs. That is what we will have. Is it anything of which we can boast ourselves? The hon. the Home Member also said that there was the question of protection which we had not taken account of. But, there is the other thing also, namely, the property; there is the capital value for which you give no credit at all. If any forest is leased out, or if any large property exists, you ought to set apart something for the lease of the property, i.e., for the advantages you derive by having the property. It is not a matter of merely spending money."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"May I ask a question, Sir, as to what exactly is the sum that should be so set apart?"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"It is not a question, Sir, as to what amount should be set apart. But what I said was that if he wants to take credit for the protection work he was doing, he must also have a debit for the use of the property and the natural advantages from the forests. I think that is a business proposition. If a company was to work a forest for exploitation purposes, it will have to pay some rent, then it will have to pay some amount for working the timber and so the value of the timber will have to cover not only the expenditure on that forest but also the rent. I am only saying here that in the case of the accounts that are supplied to us in the budget no credit is taken for the value of those forests. So, there are those two items. If Rs. 9 lakhs, and if the interest for the capital on those forests have been debited against the administration, then we will be in a position to see what we should credit for the protection work done. So, we must know, Sir, as to how these things are being done and what profit there will be if this be done. But that is not done, Sir. Last year, the question was raised by several Members when the question of the Chenat Nair forest came up and we were all of opinion that the whole thing ought to be treated as a commercial proposition. I mean that this question of exploitation alone ought to be treated as a commercial proposition and some account ought to be kept in order to show in the budget the amount you allow for the use of the property. Now, Sir, we are working the Russellkonda forest, we are working the Mount Stuart forest, Nilambur forest, and the Chenat Nair forest. These are being worked on an exploitation basis. We ought to have accounts of the exploitation both the credits and the debits.

"Then, Sir, there is one other thing about which a lot has been said; I mean conservation. Well, what sort of conservation is necessary? Is anything done, anything like a systematic arrangement carried on in the forest administration? We have got four forest officers in a place like Coimbatore alone. I should think that a major number of those officers have to deal with forests containing only grazing grounds. Each one of these officers has a very costly establishment, a large number of forest rangers and so on. Is all that necessary? To what account is it to go? Is it for protection, or conservation, or exploitation? Let us know something of them. So, Sir, the sooner we divide these forests into protective forests, exploitation forests, and other forests, the better. Then, as I said, we ought to have separate accounts of both debits and credits in regard to exploitation forests, and then again with regard to class IV and V forests I recommend that they should be handed over at once to the Revenue Department. If that is done, they will disappear from the forest budget. We ought to know what is actually being done for these big exploitation schemes instead of our accepting something that is said or leaving the matter with a mere picture of words that convey no meaning to us."

13th March 1923]

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Sir, my hon. friend is quite right in suggesting that the accounts of exploitation work should be kept separately. We are taking steps to separate these accounts. For some months past we have had trained accountants advising us as to the form in which these accounts should be kept. In the case of the Chenat Nair and the Russellkonda schemes, we have submitted proposals to the Auditor-General for his sanction to bring the projects under what we call the commercial accounts system. As soon as sanction is accorded, the accounts will be drawn up on commercial lines and they will be placed at the disposal of hon. Members of this House."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"May I know, Sir, whether the accounts of the Russellkonda saw mill will be made available to us?"

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"The new system of keeping accounts has not yet been introduced. It is proposed to introduce it from the beginning of April next. From that date the accounts of these concerns will be kept on the lines approved by the Auditor-General."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"Sir, we were assured that the Russellkonda saw mill was run on business lines; if so, accounts should have been kept separately on a commercial basis from the very beginning."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"I do not know if any commercial concern ever thinks of presenting its accounts in less than one year. The first year's accounts of the Russellkonda business will shortly be made up and will be made available in due course."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 44'16 lakhs minus 1 lakh under Demand IV.—Forests was put and carried.

The grant was made.

The House then adjourned at 5-20 p.m. to meet at 11 a.m. the next day.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,  
*Secretary to the Legislative Council.*

#### APPENDIX C.

[Vide page 2242 supra]

#### G.O. No. 98, Judicial (Police), dated 1st March 1923.

At the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 15th September 1922 the Council sanctioned a supplementary grant of Rs. 10,674 under "47. Miscellaneous" to meet the cost of granting certain concessions to Police officers and men who worked in connexion with the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. One of the items of expenditure included within this grant was the payment of gratuities to the members of the City Police staff at a total cost of Rs. 6,608 on the following scale :—

						RS.
Constables	..	..	..	.	..	3 each.
Head constables	..	..	.	..	.	4 "
Sub-inspectors	..	..	..	..	..	20 "
Sergeants	..	..	..	..	..	25 "
Inspectors	..	..	..	..	..	30 "